

Lindenwood University

Digital Commons@Lindenwood University

---

George Champlin Sibley Papers

George and Mary Easton Sibley Papers

---

1849

## History of the First Presbyterian Church of St Charles, 1818-1849

George Champlin Sibley

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.lindenwood.edu/george>



Part of the [United States History Commons](#)

---

THE HISTORY  
OF  
THE  
FIRST PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH  
OF  
SAINT CHARLES, MISSOURI.

---

---

From the 30th August 1818, when the church was first organized, to the  
30th August 1849, Inclusive.

---

---

Written and compiled from the best and most authentic materials extant,  
in compliance with the particular request of the Minutes and Ruling Elders--  
(The Session)--of the same Church-- BY a Member, - 1849.

---

---

TO THE SESSION OF THE FIRST PRESBYTERIAN  
CHURCH  
OF SAINT CHARLES, MISSOURI.

About seven years ago I gave a reluctant promise to "The Session" upon their particular request, to write the History of this Church; with the understanding, however, that such a history was required as might serve merely as a Sort of Record to be preserved on file with the Archives of the Church; not to be printed, or even published any farther beyond its bounds than the Session might from time to time think fit to allow with their Special permission:- The Church had but recently (when the request was made) emerged from a State of great peril and despondency, into which it had been thrown by two unhappy controversies with two Presbyterian Ministers (H. Chamberlain and Jas. Gallaher). The first of which began in January 1835, and the other ended in 1840. I had, in 1837, published a narrative of such events as had transpired in relation to Mr. Chamberlain's Agency in disturbing our peace, and that gentleman had replied to my publication by a printed pamphlet, which it was supposed would call from me some further replication, which I had indeed furnished to Mr. Chamberlain in 5 or 6 letters, not designed to be published, however.

The prime object of the Session in their request to me was to preserve the authentic facts touching our difficulties with Mr. Chamberlain and the causes of our disconnection with Mr. Gallaher and his friends; which they supposed I could furnish, together with such other facts as might furnish a consecutive history of the church.

To affect the prime object as to Mr. Chamberlain, I have embodied herein the two printed pamphlets, and copies of my letters to Mr. C., in which I review his last publication. I also annex a pamphlet of Mr. Chamberlain's dated in July 1836- - - Touching the difficulty with Mr. Gallaher. I have stated nothing more nor less than what I believe to be true; and if disputed, can be easily proved.

These two troubles "The Chamberlain disturbance", and the "connection and disconnection of Rev. Jas. Gallaher", necessarily occupy much of the Volume, and some weary readers of it may think that they have both been rather too much amplified. But they are both very important events in our History, and it was deemed better to risk a little prolixity, rather than to hazard the omission of any thing in details and illustrations, that might be useful in giving fair and correct understanding of those memorable trials and conflicts of our Church, each of which it is believed involved its very existence-- It was in this view of the matter that some things apparently merely personal to myself have been introduced, as good and authentic illustrations--If some of these have a personal relation to myself they are not entirely so, certainly; and they are enough related to our History, not only to justify their introduction but fully to authorize it.--

Whosoever may venture to travel thro this book will assuredly have a tedious and weary journey of it, and will find much to complain of and to censure. Some will think it contains entirely too much. Some others that it contains too little. None, I apprehend, will be quite satisfied. I am by no means satisfied with it myself, and yet this is the best History of this Church that I can furnish out of the scanty material accessible to me.

With all its imperfection, not to mention defects in the arrangement, and its Homespun dress, I feel pretty confident that this Volume will be found to contain a truthful History of our Church, in all essential particulars, which with the help of the Index may be Chronologically traced.--

Such as it is, I submit and surrender it to "The Dession."

(Signed) Geo. C. Sibley.

LindenWood September 1849.

CONTENTS

	Page
"Recent History" of the Church, a printed pamphlet	1 to 24
Authorship of Recent History demanded and given	24
H. Chamberlain's answer to certain charges against him, a printed pamphlet, Published July '36	27 to 34
H. Chamberlain's reply to the "Recent History", a printed pamphlet, published by him in July 1837	37 to 46
Notice of Errors and mistakes in the Recent History	47 to 48
Review of, and reply to H. Chamberlain's Publication of July 1837--In six letters to Mr. C.	49. to 158
Extract from a letter of Rev. Rob't I. Breckenridge	168
Narrative continued relating chiefly to H. Chamberlain	159 to 188
Petition of the Elders and Decons of the Church, to the General Assembly, dated 4th May, 1840	166 to 172
The final decision of the General Assemby on the case of H. Chamberlain--June V, 1840	173
Exhibit--cost of building the church, contributors thereto, A. A. Warden's complaint---explanations, etc.	189-205
Rev. F. R. Gray's letter to the Session--18th Feb., 1835	206 to 213
Remarks on Mr. Gray's lette	214
Proceedings of Synod in H. Chamberlain's care	226 to 232
H. Chamberlain's appeal, in full, from the Synod to the General Assembly, October 1835	215 to 225
Remarks on H. Chamberlain's appeal	232 to 254
H. Chamberlain's controversy with Mrs. Nelson about her claim on him for borrowed money	255 to 286
History of the Connection and Disconnection of the Rev. James Gallaher, with the 1st, Presbyterian Church of St. Cs.	288 to 357
Appendix to the above mentioned History	358 to 372

Narrative (History of the Church) continued from pages 188 and 357 to the 30th August 1849	374 to 404
A full list of all members received into the Church from its formation to 30th August 1849	405 to 430
Index.	431.

THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH

Of St. Charles, Missouri.

ITS RECENT HISTORY:

STRIFE AND DISTURBANCE.

---

---

Introduction.

A sense of duty constrains the writer to prepare this narrative, after having examined a great mass of testimony; the greater part of which was obtained from the records of the St. Charles and Missouri Presbyteries, and the Synod of Missouri--the facts proven from those records, together with such as he knows he can prove by competent witnesses, and can verify himself, from his own knowledge; will form the basis on which he means to found the following story: which it is his purpose to relate as briefly and plainly as he can.

The objects in view are, to collect and preserve the facts touching the unhappy dissention that exists in this church: to arrange and set them forth in their natural order, and to present the whole subject impartially to the understandings of all who are interested in knowing how the truth stands in relation to the parties implicated. And the writer indulged a hope, that he shall thus be able to afford a good and sufficient arguments to all those who are immediately concerned, to unite in a firm and consistent course of action, to put an end to this unprofitable contention. For it cannot be disguised or concealed, that the strife and disturbance now prevailing in this church, have a decided tendency to paralise and destroy its legitimate influence, and render it an object of merited reproach--they present to the surrounding multitude, too much evidence, that more exertion is used to make proselytes to the opposing parties, than to the true Religion.

-----  
The Narrative.

1. The character of this Church and Congregation for peace and concord having been called in question, makes it proper to commence the narrative thus far back. This will be a mere sketch, however; sufficient to enable the reader to draw a just inference.
2. The late Rev. Charles S. Robinson, was the last settled minister of the church of St. Charles. He died in September 1828. There is no evidence that there existed any discord in the church during the ministry of that excellent man. It is testified by several witnesses, that Mr. R. once was supposed to have had a theological difference with his brother-in-law, Mr. Lindsay, and that Mr. Robinson became dissatisfied, and spoke of leaving St. Charles, on account of that difference. Mr. Lindsay himself, testifies, however, that there was no such difference; and it is fully proved, that the most intimate friendship existed between Mr. R. and Mr. L. during the whole period of Mr. R.'s ministry here.
3. Not so long after the death of Mr. Robinson, the Rev. Hiram Chamberlain visited St. Charles, and preached morning and evening; during the interval between the two sermons, Mr. Thomas Lindsay, a Ruling Elder, met Mr. Chamberlain at Dr. Wilson's, where they had some conversation relative to certain doctrines held by Mr. C, which Mr. Lindsay pronounced unsound; and told Mr. C., "that he did not wish him to preach here any more."

4. In April, 1829, an effort was made by Judge Tucker and some others, to introduce Mr. Chamberlain into this church as its minister. A written invitation, signed by twenty-four persons, ten of whom it is believed were members of the church, was presented to Mr. C., requesting him "to locate himself in St. Charles, at least for a season." Mr. Chamberlain refused to accept this invitation, for this reason, as he stated, that Mr. Lindsay and family and the widow of the late Pastor had not joined in it-- The invitation was strenuously opposed by Mr. Lindsay and some others, which induced several of those who had signed it to withdraw their names. It appears from the testimony, that some excitement was produced in the congregation on this subject. Several public meetings were held, and much effort made to overrule Mr. Lindsay's objections to Mr. Chamberlain; but without success. The dispute ended in Mr. C.'s refusing to accept the invitation.

5. In the winter 1830, the Rev. George C. Wood accepted an invitation for a year; at the expiration of which, the session did not renew the invitation. A strong desire was manifested however, by a considerable majority of both church and congregation, to retain Mr. Wood another year. This was firmly opposed by two Elders, (Lindsay and Watson) and fourteen other members; who in a written protest gave as their reasons for opposing the wishes of the majority, that "although we entertain a high regard for Mr. Wood was a Christian brother, and esteem him as a useful and good citizen, we nevertheless feel he not calculated to do as much good in a place like St. Charles, as some other person might be. We do not wish to let our sympathies and partialities blind our judgments and lead us to forget that in choosing a Pastor it is our duty rather to consider who will be most likely 'TO TURN MANY TO RIGHTEOUSNESS', than to consult our own predilections in favor of any individual whatever."

This opposition produced some excited feeling in the church and congregation for a short time; but it was soon calmed, and peace and harmony restored, by a prudent course pursued by Mr. Wood. He knew that it was his duty to retire, and not seek to enter a church, the door of which was closed against him by its sworn guardians; for although the popular clamor demanded admittance for him, he resisted the flattering solicitation; being well aware, that it was the duty of a Presbyterian Minister to rebuke, and not to encourage confusion in the church. Mr. Wood left St. Charles with the esteem of all; by none was he MORE esteemed than those who had, in duty as they believed, declined to offer him a second invitation. He is now occupying a station for which his talents and habits are suitable, and his labours are believed to be attended with much success in his ministry.

6. After Mr. Wood, came Mr. Hall and Mr. Nicholas, in succession; each of whom ministered to the church and congregation by invitation, a year; the last term expiring in the fall of 1834. Nothing occurred during either of their ministrations, that need be noticed in this sketch. They both left the church in peace, and with the esteem of most of its members

#### CHAPTER II--

##### The Rev. F.R. Gray invited.

1. In October 1834, the Synod of Missouri held its annual session in St. Charles, and was attended throughout, by an unusual number of ministers. The church of St. Charles, then consisting of near about seventy members, including four Elders and three Deacons: had not yet obtained a minister in place in place of Mr. Nicholas; and the session was making anxious enquiries for a suitable person. The occasion, ( so many minister being present) was deemed propitious. The members and congregation generally, had become very desirous of settling a Pastor; and as it was known that several of the ministers then at St. Charles, were not permanently located, and were at liberty to accept a call, the wish became general, and was frequently expressed, that proper measures should be promptly used, to effect that object.



Mr. Chamberlain, Mr. Gray and Mr. Brown, were frequently mentioned as fit persons to invite. Mr. Chamberlain was not a stranger to St. Charles. On a former occasion ( See Ch. 1 P. 4 ) his friends had field to obtain admission for him, and it was known that the same, and even greater opposition still existed against him. It was therefore deemed altogether unwise and impolitic to hazard the interruption of the harmony and good feeling that then so happily prevailed in the church and congregation, by making any serious proposal to invite Mr. C; this was the more readily conceded on the part of Mr. C's particular friends, because it was found that there was an almost perfect unanimity in favor of another.

2. All could unite with entire cordiality, in an invitation to Rev. F. R. Gray; at least it was satisfactorily ascertained, that there were very few, if any, of the church, who would not very readily waive any predilections they might have for another; and for the sake of harmony join in support of Mr. Gray.

3. Such was the prevailing sentiment, when the Synod adjourned; and in a general meeting was appointed to be held on the 2nd day of November, to consummate the united wish of the session, members and congregation, to call Mr. Gray.

3. The meeting took place according to appointment, and was very well attended. After some desultory inquiries as to the probability of Mr. Gray being willing to come to St. Charles, ( of which some doubts had been suggested ) the meeting, on motion; "Resolved that the session be requested to invite the Rev. R. F. Gray to be pastor of this Church.--" But before the question was put on this resolution, it was moved to amend, so as to ask the session to invite "Mr. Gray, OR SOME OTHER MINISTER."-- Many present believed at the time that the mover of this amendment, (who was not a church member) had it in view to nominate Mr. Chamberlain: and such he has since declared to be his intention. His motion was not entertained by the meeting, but instantly rejected. The resolution as first moved, was then adopted nem, con. Not a breath of opposition to Mr. Gray was publicly manifested at this meeting. No other person was nominated or named. In truth the single purpose for which the meeting was appointed, was to adopt the preliminary formalities for calling Mr. Gray.

4. As it was known that Mr. Gray's engagement at Columbia would prevent his coming to St. Charles before the ensuing May, even if he should accept this invitation; a resolution was adopted to authorize and request the session, to procure some other minister until that time, expressing the wish that Mr. Brown might be procured, or if the session failed in that, to obtain the occasional services of Mr. Lovejoy. Subscriptions were then made, quite liberal, to sustain those resolutions, and there was no reason to doubt that very ample provision would readily be made in due season.

5. The whole proceedings of this meeting, were conducted with perfect harmony, and with a spirit that evinced an earnest desire that its object might be accomplished. For though some doubts were entertained and expressed, as to the result of the invitation to Mr. Gray, there were none as to the expediency of the application, and its happy effects if successful. And a most reasonable expectation seemed to be indulged by all; that as the little jars that had previously occurred in the church and congregation, were all now entirely quieted. The blessed spirit of peace and concord, was about to exercise its benign influence over our community with unwonted power and effect: And the prospect of much future prosperity in the church was indeed highly encouraging, and very cheering to the hearts of all those, who felt warmly interested in the Christian cause.

But alas! how bitterly have these expectations and hopes been disappointed and destroyed.

### CHAPTER III

A Necessary digression. Mr. Thomas Lindsay, Sen. Ruling Elder.

1. This venerated servant of the church, occupies so conspicuous a place in its history, and has been so frequently mentioned in connection with the unfortunate contention that has arisen since the invitation of Mr. Grayl t at it is due to him, as well as to the subject in hand; that the reader should know something more about him; or, to speak more properly, that those concerned in the "strife and disturbnace" about to be detailed, should be reminded of the nature of his connection with the church; of HIS high obligations to preserve its Presbyterian character, and of THEIRS to co-operate with him in all his legitimate endeavors to that end. This appears to be the more necessary; because a great deal of the blame of "disturbing the peace of the church of St. Charles," has been imputed to Mr. Lindsay.
2. It appears from the recorded testimony, referred to in the introduction, that Mr. Lindsay is by some thought to be too rigid--by others not enough so. By one, exceedingly intolerant; by another, much the reverse. It is complained of him, by some, that he is too fond of exercising his power as a ruling Elder; by others that he is very remiss in that particular--by some that he acts too little, and by THE SAME, that he acts too much. These contradictory complaints are found throughout the testimony introduced by Mr. Chamberlain. Nearly all the SAME witnesses agree however, in testifying that Mr. Lindsay possesses a most thorough knowledge of, and experience in church matters, and the most exemplanry piety--that he is esteemed as "the Father of the church of St. Charles"; and has already manifested great devotedness to its spiritual welfare; and ALL AGREE in according to him perfect integrity of purpose in all things.
3. The chief object of so much testimony concerning Mr. Lindsay, appears to have been, to prove his inflexible adherence to his own views, as to essential church interests; even when opposed by considerable majorities; and a great complaint seems to hhave been that IN SUCH CASES, his views have generally prevailed. To break down this influence, which it was said that Mr. Lindsay had too long held over the church, especially in its choice of a minister; was a favorite object in the early part of 1835, with a few individuals who had then but recently become members; and it is believed that the strenuous efforts to effect that object have, more than anything else, produced the strife and disturbance, that have so greatly injured this church and clighted the fair prospects it had in view at the close of the year 1834.
4. Whether the age, experience, long residence, high christian character, and acknowledged faithfulness as one of the constitutional guardians of the Church of St. Charles, entitle Mr. Lindsay to the confidence and DEFERENCE of the junior and newly admitted members, especially in the election of a pastor: all those concerned must decide for themselves, in the fear of God and their consciences. The suggestion will naturally arise in every candid mind, how much more safely the inexperienced wayfarers amy submit to the guidance of long known and long tried friends and borhters, than to strangers.
- Mr. Lindsay is well and extensively known, as a learned, experienced, old and devoted christian. His views and opinions on church matters, and the interests of religion, are certainly entitled to much respect. If he is firm and inflexible in adherence to his deliberate convictions of duty as a ruling Elder; never swerving to the right hand or to the left, to secure any man's favor, or to avert any man's frown; it is very well known, that in his ordinary intercourse with mankind, he possesses much of the "milk of human kindness".
5. Although there is no evidence of a deliberate design to injure this venerable Patriarch of our little church, except as states in Paragraph 3, yet it cannot be denied that the tendency of the effort to destroy his official influence, HOWEVER RIGHTEOUS THAT EFFORT MAY HAVE BEEN IN ITSELF, has been to lessen his usefulness in some degree, and in a far greater measure to injure the Holy cause to which he has been so long and faithfully devoted.

This effort, though it MAY have been intended for good, being essentially an irregular procedure, has without doubt, produced confusion; the natural concomitants of which, are strife and disturbance. What follows of this narrative will serve to set forth more in detail, the progress of the mischief alluded to; and peradventure its authors and fomenters may also be discovered and presented to the reader.

#### CHAPTER IV.

Mr. Chamberlain come to St. Charles. The disturbance begins.

1. Mr. Chamberlain came to St. Charles early in January 1835, on his way, it is said, to Memphis, Tennessee. He preached in the Methodist Chapel on Sunday, the 4th day of that month, and on the same day a proposition was circulated to engage him as a temporary supply, under the second resolution of the meeting of the 2nd November, ( see Chap. II, P. 4.) it being understood that Mr. Brown could not come, and there was but little expectation of getting Mr. Lovejoy. The proposal to invite Mr. Chamberlain to preach about six weeks was favorably received by many; probably the greater number of those who heard it. He was desired by some of the Elders, Mr. Lindsay not concurring, to remain and preach the NEXT Sabbath, which he agreed to do. This request was made in compliance with the wish of some half dozen members of the church. Meanwhile there was considerable effort made by a few of Mr. Chamberlain's particular friends, to induce a general concurrence in the proposition already spoken of, to invite Mr. C. to stay and preach six weeks; and it was understood that the subject would be submitted to the congregation on the coming Sunday. Previous to the arrival of that day, the rumor had gone abroad, that Mr. Chamberlain would not consent to remain six weeks unless there was a probability of his being invited for a year, or as the settled Pastor, at the expiration of the six weeks; and the report was by many believed. In fact, it was by most persons considered, that it was by no means the ultimate object of Mr. C's friends to invite him here for six weeks ONLY.
2. It will, no doubt, strike every candid reader, that it was manifestly indelicate, not to say improper, to think of presenting to ANY one an invitation for a permanent location, or even for six months; before any definite answer had been received from Mr. Gray: especially as the contemplated movement in favor of Mr. Chamberlain, was not predicated on the contingency of Mr. Gray's refusal. Under such circumstances, it would seem perfectly reasonable to expect opposition from the session to the proposed measure, even though there had been no other objections to Mr. C.
3. On the appointed Sabbath (11th January) the congregation attended Mr. Chamberlain's preaching. The so much talked of ELECTION had no small influence in drawing many thar. The sermon was appropriate to the occasion; having for its leading object; to caution the hearers; and especially such as were to take part in the election, against the influence of prejudice. The subject of the proposed election was unexpectedly postponed 'till afternoon; when there were much fewer of the people assembled. After the sermon "the congregation was called, and Hugh H. Wardlaw was called to the chair. On motion it was resolved that the session be instructed to secure the services of Mr. Chamberlain, for at least five or six weeks.
4. The above resolution was opposed: but it passed by a small majority; several persons voting on both sides who were not entitled to vote.-- Only about twenty-six members of the church were present; of whom it is believed 14 voted in the affirmative. Mr. Chamberlain accepted the above invitation, which was announced to him on the day following by two of the Elders, Messrs. Lindsay and Watson refusing to participate in the measure.

5. It will be seen that the invitation for six weeks, which Mr. Chamberlain signified his acceptance of, on the 15th of January; was sanctioned by the votes of about FOURTEEN members, and TWO Elders of the Church, and opposed by about FOURTEEN other members, including two Senior Elders. And it ought to be borne in mind, that the church of St. Charles numbered FIFTY-NINE white and ELEVEN colored members.

6. In about two weeks after Mr. Chamberlain had thus identified himself with THIS procedure; ANOTHER project was set on foot by some of his friends; the avowed object of which, was to establish him as PASTOR of this church. With this view a petition was addressed to the session, requesting "to convene the congregation on the third Sabbath in February for the purpose of holding an election in favor of Rev. H. Chamberlain as Pastor of this church."

7. It appears that Mr. Alex B. Campbell, one of the elders, used much exertion to procure signatures of this petition; resorting to certain expedients which, to say the least of them, was disengenuous and unfair.-- And it also appears that Mr. Chamberlain himself exerted an influence not strictly justifiable, in the premises. The result of all this effort, was FIFTY-SIX subscribers in all; THIRTY-THREE of whom were church members, only TWENTY-FIVE of the latter number were, it is believed, members of THIS church. So that TWENTY-FIVE of the FIFTY-NINE white members of the church of St. Charles, including one elder, with THIRTY-ONE others, not members, constituted the true force of the petition. A force that seems to have been quite respectable. The petition itself, was in its language, decorous and respectful.

8. As might have been recently expected; the attempt to introduce Mr. Chamberlain into the church as its Pastor, created no little agitation in its bosom; and quickly excited much unpleasant feeling throughout its bounds. Mr. C. was warned by two of the Elders, Lindsay and Watson, that he could not enter through the session; that many members were decidedly opposed to him; that if he persisted he would cause much strife and trouble, and destroy the peace of the church, and finally advised him to desist and leave the place. At first it was hoped that Mr. C. would pursue this course; as he had on several occasions, whilst these agitations were commencing, declared himself to be "TOO GOOD A PRESBYTERIAN TO ENTER THE CHURCH EXCEPT THROUGH THE DOOR OF THE SESSION." But he seems to have been influenced subsequently, by other considerations; for on one occasion, when the invitation to Mr. Gray, and pledge of the church to support HIM, was mentioned to Mr. C. as a reason why he ought not to expect any thing like a cordial reception and support; he replied, that he had been told that if he would remain, a good salary would be made up for him, and no more be said about Mr. Gray.

9. The session could not in good faith comply with the request of the petitioners; because they were in actual negotiation with Mr. Gray, in obedience to the unanimous resolution of the November meeting; and had reason to hope for his acceptance. Besides, the whole proceeding was considered as rather disorderly, and entirely uncalled for by the actual condition of the church, and it was deemed utterly hopeless EVER to unite the church under Mr. Chamberlain; and little less than a wanton act of discourtesy towards Mr. Gray; and of ruin to our peace, to attempt it.

10. For these reasons, the session declined calling the meeting requested in the petition; three of the four elders concurring. The other, elder, Campbell, took it upon himself, however, to appoint the meeting, as in compliance with the petition, and invited Reb. Mr. Potts, of St. Louis, to act as Moderator. The day came, 22nd February, and the meeting took place as notified. Rev. Mr. Potts having declined being present, Mr. Clayce was invited to the chair, and B.R. Wardlaw acted as Secretary. The object of the meeting having been announced by the Chairman "to elect Rev. H. Chamberlain Pastor," etc., Mr. Thomas Lindsay, Sen. presented a protest signed by himself, Mr. Black and Mr. Watson, Elders, and Mr. Copes and Mr. Jordan, Deacons, remonstrating against the proceeding as tending to destroy the peace of the church, being "in opposition to the known wishes of the undersigned, who are sworn guardians and protectors of the spiritual and temporal interests, order and well being of said church; and also in opposition to the opinion and wishes of twenty or more, of its members. We also enter our protest

against the means already resorted to, to procure the names of members to a subscription for the purposes aforesaid, and against all means that are decided upon or may be decided upon by a part of the members, to force Mr. Chamberlain into the Presbyterian Church of St. Charles, contrary, as we believe to the peace and union of this church."

11. The protest of this session produced some warm discussion; but the objections were overruled by a majority of voices; and when the main question was put, ( the record says) "Mr. Chamberlain was UNANIMOUSLY chosen Pastor of this church for one year, SO FAR AS ANY VOICE WAS EXPRESSED." Although there were several present who warmly supported the views of the session, and tried to dissuade the conductors of the meeting from their purpose; they declined any further participation in the proceedings. When the final vote was put, there was no negative voice heard. Several persons voted, who were not members of ANY church; and some church members voted who were not of THIS church. It is believed to be impracticable now, to ascertain with exact certainty, how many members PROPER were present on that occasion, or how many of those who WERE there voted for Mr. Chamberlain. The differ widely as to this fact. Some THINK Mr. C. had a LARGE majority of the church: others BELIEVE he had NOT the majority. Mr. Emmons SUPPOSES there was a large majority, tho', he says "the number of votes for Mr. C. was not counted." This SUPPOSITION is not at all concurred in by Mr. Alex. B. Campbell, who from the active and prominent part he is known to have borne in the whole affair from first to last, may justly be considered the most intelligent witness. HE testifies that he DOES NOT THINK a majority of all the members voted, though he KNOWS there was a majority present; and says further, that he THINKS all those who signed the petition did NOT vote for Mr. C.; that one or two of them did no HE THINKS. Allowing Mr. Campbell's testimony on this point, to be pretty well founded, it would seem that about TWENTY-FOUR members PROPER voted for Mr. Chamberlain. Which number is less by SIX, than a majority of all the white members belonging to the church of St. Charles at that time. There appears to be yet better ground for the belief, that of those who voted on that occasion for Mr. C., not over TWENTY-TWO were members of this church. After much enquiry, the writer is of the opinion that this is the nearest approximation to the truth of the matter, ever to be reasonable expected.

12. It is proper here to state, that Mr. Chamberlain was absent from St. Charles when the election took place; having shortly before gone up to Franklin.

Meanwhile the session was in correspondence with Mr. Gray. In one of their letters to him, they urged him to accept the invitation to the church, and expressed much apprehension that if he did not, Mr. Chamberlain would probably settle in St. Charles when the election took place; and if he did, the peace of the church would be entirely destroyed. Mr. R. B. Wardlaw, who was the bearer of this letter, "substantiated its contents to some considerable extent," as Mr. Gray testifies; and when Mr. Wardlaw returned to St. Charles, he expressed the opinion that Mr. Gray would accept the invitation. On the 18th of Febraury, Mr. Gray wrote to the session that he had yet decided whether to accept or not, but soon would.

#### CHAPTER V.

Mr. Chamberlain and Mr. Gray--New Elders--Mr. Chamberlain accepts, etc.

1. Such was the condition of these affairs when Mr. Chamberlain went up to Franklin. Soon after his arrival at that place, he had an interview with Mr. Gray at the tavern where Mr. G. boarded. Mr. Chamberlain introduced conversation by asking Mr. G. if he had heard that he, Mr. C. had been supplanting him at St. Charles? which led to a long conversation between them; in the course of which Mr. Chamberlain told Mr. Gray, that there was opposition when his, Mr. Gray's name was put in nomination at the St. Charles meeting in November, 1834. That to him, Mr. C., there were bgt THREE opposed, in fact, in sentiment; but there were TEN others, who under the influence of these three would act against him. That if he, Gray, or any other minister could unite that people, he Mr. C., would say go, with all his heart. That if he, Mr. G., went to St. Charles on the invitation authorized

by the November meeting there would be opposition to him the same as there would be to him, Mr. C., or any one else. That he felt it to be his duty to apprise Mr. Gray of the state of things in St. Charles, in case he should have any thought of going there.

2. It is not unreasonable to suppose that such remarks as these, coming from a brother minister fresh from the field of which he draws so forbidding a picture, should have considerable influence on the mind of a young minister whose great repugnance to an atmosphere of strife and disturbance was well known. Whether they were INTENDED to deter Mr. Gray from accepting the invitation to St. Charles, or actually DID deter him, it is not clearly in evidence. It is certain, however, that he soon afterwards determined NOT to accept the invitation; and it is also certain, that Mr. Chamberlain was entirely mistaken as to every material fact concerning "the state of things in St. Charles," as stated in his conversation with Mr. Gray in the last paragraph. True, it is, that Mr. C. had but recently left the church and congregation of St. Charles in no little confusion; but the proof is perfectly clear, that it was produced by his own unaccountable conduct in allowing himself to be a candidate for the pastoral office, knowing, as he certainly must, that Mr. Gray had been PREVIOUSLY invited to the same office by the united voice of the session, church and congregation; and that he had not yet (even at the time of Mr. C's interview with him at Franklin) communicated to the session, whether he would accept or not. Mr. C. surely must have known, early in January, that there was a very great and decided opposition to HIM in St. Charles; and before he went to Franklin, in February, he must have been perfectly well aware that three of the four elders, two of the deacons and at least TWENTY of the members of the church BESIDES, were irremediably opposed to him. And it is the natural inference from these facts, that Mr. Chamberlain's withdrawal from a place where his presence produced so much strife, was his reasonable and plain course; leaving the "state of things in St. Charles" as he found them, in a perfect unity of sentiment towards Mr. Gray, who was undoubtedly the minister most likely, under God, to build up this church in union and christian fellowship. Those who may have MISLED Mr. C. into the palpable error and unfortunate course that he adopted, have had abundant cause to mourn over the effects of their ill judged advice; although some of them may not even yet be convinced of their own mistaken Views.

3. Although Mr. Chamberlain manifested so much solicitude lest Mr. Gray should be misled by what the session had assured him was the unanimous wish of the church and congregation, as expressed at the meeting in November ( see Chap. II) and find himself amid strife and confusion if HE went to St. Charles, without any reasonable hope that HE would be able "to unite that people"; it appears that he himself determined, about that time, to make the essay. On the morning of the 7th of March, he received (in a letter from Mr. A. B. Campbell of the 2nd.) an account of the meeting of the 22nd February, and on the same day wrote to Mr. Campbell, authorising him to give PUBLIC notice that he would "visit the CHURCH of St. Charles again in a few weeks, for the purpose, as he tells Mr. G., of preaching the gospel of Peace, and of justifying himself.

4. The record goes on to say ( in connection with the meeting in February ) "accordingly, on the 17th day of April, Mr. Chamberlain arrived and on the Sabbath of the 25th of April, at the request of Mr. Campbell, only acting elder, a meeting of the church was called, after the morning service; and on motion, Rev. H. Chamberlain was called to the chair, and B. R. Wardlaw appointed Secretary. The two following resolutions were unanimously adopted:--"Whereas, three members of the existing session of this church, have refused to act when petitioned by a majority of the church and congregation, Therefore, resolved; that it is expedient to call a public meeting, for the purpose of electing one or more ruling elders of this church. Resolved, that public notice be given, that such a meeting will be held on the 2nd Sabbath in May, immediately after the morning service, and a general attendance be requested."

Although it is thus set forth (the record is exactly and fully quoted) that these resolutions were UNANIMOUSLY adopted at a meeting of THE CHURCH, convened after the MORNING SERVICE, at the request of Mr. Campbell, ONLY acting elder; at which meeting

REV. H. CHAMBERLAIN presided; and although the actual proceedings of the meeting, were, no doubt, correctly given as above copied from the report of Mr. Wardlaw; yet it is obviously proper, in order to correct any erroneous impressions that the LANGUAGE of the record may produce, as to the true character of the meeting, to add a few words of explanation. The writer has no idea that any deception was actually intended; but it is very clearly of opinion that the construction of the document in question, is such as might lead many into error on a very important point in this history, and this opinion is sustained by the fact that in about two weeks after the adoption of the resolutions Mr. Chamberlain and his little party did undisguisedly assume to be the "Presbyterian church of St. Charles:" which assumption, whether designed or not, is very plainly to be INFERRED from the record of the little meeting on the 26th April; so that without this explanation, those not apprised of the real facts, might most naturally fall into a mistake that the resolutions to elect one or more new elders, were the offspring of a GENERAL MEETING OF THE CHURCH; when, in truth they were sanctioned by only a few members, who had been persuaded to withdraw themselves from the session, and to support Mr. Chamberlain, contrary to their advice and earnest remonstrances. The meeting of "THE CHURCH", consisted of less than a THIRD part of its members, and among the absentees were THREE of the FOUR Elders, and TWO of the THREE deacons; and those who assented to the resolutions, as well as those who proposed them, knew that they were acting contrary to the wishes of the session, and a large number BESIDES, of their fellow members. The allegations, that Mr. Campbell was then the ONLY acting member of the church, and that "Three members of the existing session" had "refused to act when petitioned by a majority of the church and congregation" are also very far from being correct. Messrs. Lindsay, Watson and Black, were still acting elders as well as Mr. Campbell. Nor had they refused to act when petitioned by a majority, etc. For though no such petition was ever presented to them, (so they aver) yet the record certified by Mr. Wardlaw, shows that they DID act in relation to the very petition referred to. (See Cahp. IV., P. 10.) It is indeed true that their action was in opposition to the views of the petitioners, for reasons which they considered good and sufficient in the premises; and which their duty as the sworn guardians of the church forbade them to disregard; so they delcare. If they erred in this; if they were bound by the sacred obligations of their office, to do the SPECIFIC BIDDING of a portion, even of ANY portion of the flock of their charge, contrary to their own solemn convictions of their duty; even THEN the refusal to act, could not subject them under the law of the church to the censure of SUCH a tribunal as the "MEETING OF THE CHURCH", on the 27th of April appears to have been. In such case they were amendable to the Presbytery of St. Charles only.

5. The systematic exertions of Mr. Alexander B. Campbell, and other active friends of Mr. Chamberlain, to settle him as Pastor at St. Charles; and the evident desire of that individual to meet their views, appear to have been greatly embarrassed by the invitations previously given to Mr. Gray, and the decided opposition of the Session. When the first of these obstacles was removed, there was still the other in full force. Mr. Chamberlain had often declared his "sound Presbyterian" principles, which he said would prevent his attempting to enter this church except through the DOOR OF THE SESSION, that on his arrival at St. Charles on the 17th of April, from Franklin, (after his interview with Mr. Gray) his friends still found it impracticable to introduce him, consistently with HIS WELL KNOWN SCRUPLES. The door was closed, and those who alone could open it, persisted in refusing him admittance. In this perplexing emergency, Mr. Alex. B. Campbell, as he testifies himself conceived the "scheme of electing new elders." and immediately communicating it to "several members" telling them "that if they were determined to persevere in maintaining their rights, they must elect some to assist him, that he could not stand alone." This "SCHEME" it is proper to say, Mr. Campbell claims as wholly his own device, and it does not appear that any of those who assisted in its accomplishment were ever disposed to question his right thereto. In justice to Mr. Campbell it should also be stated, that he denies it to have been the PARTICULAR OBJECT of his "scheme" to open a door for the reception of Mr. Chamberlain, though he admits, that it was designed for that among other objects. Having been revealed to the "several members", proper measures were taken on the next Sabbath, 26th April, to carry it into effect, as has been related in paragraph 4. There is no

evidence that Mr. Chamberlain countenanced or approved of these proceedings, except his participation in them as chairman of "THE MEETING OF THE CHURCH." If he had DISAPPROVED of them, however, it seems reasonable enough to conclude, that the influence of his expressed dissent would have suppressed the "SCHEME" even in its first conception.

6. Between the 26th April and the 10th May, the day appointed for the election of new elders, much dissatisfaction was openly manifested, not only in "The church" proper, but among those who had joined Mr. Chamberlain. To many of the latter "THE SCHEME" was very objectionable. It seemed to be carrying the opposition to the session beyond all proper bounds--much farther than they had ever thought of proceeding. They now discovered that the creation of a NEW SESSION to act independently of the old existing session, was the main object of Mr. Campbell's SCHEME, and that through this NEW DOOR Mr. Chamberlain was to be introduced into the church as Pastor, regardless of all opposition on the part of the session proper, and those who still united under their rightful guardianship. The proposed feature was warmly remonstrated against, as highly disorderly and unlawful; but in vain. Mr. Campbell and his associates entertained different views, and determined to persevere; earnestly entreating their followers to adhere to them through the critical emergence, to which they now found themselves reduced.-- These entreaties were in several instances unavailing, and in some others, they were with very great reluctance complied with. Of course they were addressed only to such as had formerly inclined towards Mr. Chamberlain; as the scheme was not deemed a very likely one to make proselytes. At least SIX of Mr. Chamberlain's adherents, abandoned him at this time, and several others refused to act in the approaching election. With Mr. Chamberlain it appears to have been highly desirable to obtain certain individuals in the new session. It is known that with one very worthy member, he used earnest and oft-repeated persuasions to get his consent to serve as one of the new Elders; and that he could only prevail over his great reluctance, by the assurance that if he did not consent, he, Mr. C., would be compelled to leave St. Charles.

7. The reader is now invited to the record, as certified by Mr. Wardlaw, commencing where the quotation in paragraph 4 concluded. It thus proceeds:-  
 "And accordingly on the 2nd Sabbath in May, a meeting of the church was convened. Mr Chamberlain being called to the chair, and B. R. Wardlaw appointed Secretary. On the vote being taken, it was ascertained that Mr. P. Cayce, Mr. Spencer, B.R. Wardlaw were unanimously chosen. The following resolution was also passed. Resolved, that the Rev. Mr. Chamberlain be requested to proceed to the ordination of the elders elect immediately after the morning service. Mr. Spencer's ordination was postponed for a time, on account of his not having letters of dismission from the Jacksonville Church, Illinois. After an appropriate sermon, Messrs. Cayce and Wardlaw were duly set apart to the office of Ruling Elders, as directed in the form of Government, Chapter 13." This is the whole of Mr. Wardlaw's record of the proceedings of the appointed meeting of "THE CHURCH" on the 10th day of May. From other testimony it appears that there were but very few members of the church concerned in the election---the proceedings of the meeting were altogether unopposed at the time, by any one present; those who participated in the election of the three new elders, including the chairman, did not exceed TWENTY persons; and of those some were not members of the church of St. Charles. On the very next day "the Session met at the house of Hugh H. Wardlaw. Present, A. B. Campbell, Mr. Cayce and B.R. Wardlaw---opened with prayer---A written application was then made to Mr Chamberlain to become our stated supply for ensuing year, to which he returned an affirmative answer, and took his seat as moderator of the Session. Resolved that Mrs. Barbara Eversole be received to this church by letter from Boonville church--closed with prayer." The "written application" here mentioned, was expressly predicated on the proceedings of the meeting of February 22nd; and states, that three members of the Session and two of the Deacons protested against the admission of Mr. Chamberlain---the application is dated May 11, 1835, and is signed B.R. Wardlaw, A.B. Campbell, P. Cayce, who style themselves Ruling Elders of the church of St. Charles.



It will doubtless occur to the attentive reader, and produce surprise, how promptly Mr. Chamberlain availed himself of the NEW DOOR that was in APPEARANCE thrown open to him, to enter the church: overlooking as it would seem, the very MATERIAL FACT, clearly disclosed in the "written application" that the Session, even admitting Messrs. Cayce And Wardlaw to be legitimate members, had not YET assented to his reception: there being an equal division of the six Elders; and consequently a NEGATIVE decision. The course that Mr. Chamberlain so promptly adopted on the 11th May, can only be accounted for RATIONALLY, on the supposition that he had ceased to regard Messrs. Lindsay, Watson and Black as members of the session, and that the recent election of Messrs. Cayce, Spencer and Wardlaw as elders, superceded the old session, except Mr. Campbell, who was not opposed to him. The other newly chosen elder, Mr. Spencer, it must be recollected, had not yet been ordained; in fact was still a member of a church in Illinois, and was not qualified to act as an elder, even in accordance with Mr. Chamberlain's new construction of Presbyterian law, until the 20th of September following. It is not intended to say here, that Mr. Chamberlain DID consider the three old elders superceded by the election of the new ones; or that he THEN considered them in any manner OUT of office----there is no POSITIVE evidence to that effect. But the conclusion is irresistible that if Mr. C. considered them IN office on that 11th May, 1835, he acted very inconsistently with his former views of SOUND PRESBYTERIANISM, as expressed to several of the witnesses, which forbade him to enter the church except through the door of the session; unless he considered his own vote as moderator of his new session, the legitimate and fit instrument wherewith to open that door.

8. It is true, that SUBSEQUENTLY to the 11th May ( to wit: on the 22d October of the same year ) Mr. Chamberlain in his appeal to the General Assembly does assert that the three elders, Lindsay, Watson and Black, by ABANDONING their fellow, Campbell and opposing his, Mr. C's entrance into the church "had broken themselves off, and thrown themselves out of the pale of the church," and that by their act of protest at the meeting of 22d February, 1835, ( see Chap. IV, paragraphs 9, 10, 11 ) "they did virtually throw themselves out of their official relation to the church, until they should be brought back by the strong arm of ecclesiastical law, or with subdued feelings voluntarily return to act their part as their own sense of duty might dictate." These are reasons that Mr. Chamberlain thinks proper to assign in his appeal to the General Assembly why he "entered the only official door of the church, without stopping to enquire what had become of those who had broken themselves off, etc." The strong language in which the three "recusant" elders are rebuked by Mr. C., if not threatened as above quoted from his appeal, altho' it was written after he came into OFFICE AND POWER through the "ONLY DOOR", etc., will probably appear to the candid reader, rather presumptuous; when informed that by the previous decisions of the Presbytery and Synod, ( certainly entitled to SOME respect ) the official acts of these same elders were substantially sustained, and they recognized as the session of the church of St. Charles; whilst Mr. Chamberlain's "ONLY OFFICIAL DOOR" was by those tribunals declared to be no door at all, and Mr. C. himself advised and requested to leave St. Charles, inasmuch as the election of his new elders was "IRREGULAR AND VOID" and his invitation thro' them "IRREGULAR,-----" With the full knowledge of these decisions ( altho he HAD appealed from them to the General Assembly ) it was, to say the least of it, rather LOFTY in Mr. C., to pronounce a sort of excommunication against the recognized session; so far at least as the deliberate judgment of himself and HIS NEW SESSION might go. The more than half threat of applying to those offending elders "THE STRONG ARM" of ecclesiastical law" unless they RETURN to their duty, is indeed indicative of a lofty, not to say proud spirit. The RETURN to duty, Mr. C., plainly gives to understand, as HIS meaning, consists in recognizing Mr. Campbell's "SCHEME", and associating with him and the newly elected elders as "THE SESSION". And this submission of THREE to ONE, is thus deliberately proposed to be enforced, under the peculiar circumstances that have been detailed; by those who are such strenuous champions of the rights of majorities. Into such strange inconsistencies are even the best of men often tempted, by the inordinate pursuit of a favorite scheme. Unfortunately Mr. Chamberlain and his new elders, they were were forced upon the expedient of outlawing the three refractory members of the existing session, in order to avoid the palpable indelicacy of making Mr. C. cast his own vote as moderator of the new session, in favor of his own admission, and that too by anticipation of the right to vote.

## CHAPTER VI

Complaints, decisions and appeals----events up to February, 1836.

1. On the 2nd April, 1835, a memorial was addressed to the Presbytery of St. Charles, signed by Thomas Lindsay, James H. Black, and S. S. Watson, elders, and Thomas P. Copes and Elisha H. Jordan, deacons, of the Presbyterian Church of St. Charles; complaining against Mr. Chamberlain, that he was attempting to "settle over this congregation as its Pastor, against the wishes of a very large and respectable minority ( if indeed it be a minority) of the private members of said church, and its officers. Mr. Chamberlain was early admonished that there existed obstacles to his location over this church that could not be overcome, and was kindly and affectionately, we believe in a truly christian spirit, entreated to desist from his purpose, not only by private christians in his own and other churches, but by his brethren in the ministry." The memorial also states that "to all these entreaties, motives and principles, urged seriously upon his consideration, he ( Mr. C. ) has chosen to remain deaf."-- And it further represents, "that the harmony, peace, and christian affection heretofore so happily existing in this church and amongst its members was destroyed. That an unhappy excitement prevails to such an alarming extent, as to threaten the very existence of the church, and that our members are now divided in sentiment to a very fearful extent." This document, which is pretty long, attributes the disorders that had grown up in the church at St. Charles, to Mr. Chamberlain's perseverance in trying to force himself on said church as its minister when so large a portion of its members and officers had signified to him such decided opposition.

And again, on the 28th April, Messrs. Lindsay, Watson and Black addressed another communication to the Presbytery complaining of the further proceedings of Mr. Chamberlain and his party, especially the intended election of new elders on the second Sabbath in May. In this letter they say that the conduct of Mr. C. and his party has "ruined our prospects of getting Mr. Gray or any one else. The old and most efficient members stand firm with the session, and never can receive Mr. Chamberlain as their Pastor---the whole proceedings are of such a character, as almost to exceed belief--our church is evidently all broken to pieces, and a spirit infused which we fear will not be easily if ever healed. Mr. Chamberlain and his party have carried things too far we fear to stop, and unless we can get speedy and efficient help from your body the consequences will be dreadful. You may have it to record, " WE ONCE HAD A PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN ST. CHARLES." The CHURCH and the PARTY act distinctly. Few, or none, who support good order, and have stood firm by the session, go to hear Mr. Chamberlain. We were very unwilling to trouble the Presbytery with our grievances, and could hardly believe that any minister of Jesus Christ, alive to his duty and the interests of the Redeemer's Kingdom, could ever think of forcing himself upon us under such circumstances; and we cannot think that the Presbytery will ever suffer such breaches to be committed with impunity within their bounds." Such is the nature of the complaint addressed by the session of St. Charles church, to the Presbytery of St. Charles; and on which they asked for relief and protection.

2. The Presbytery, it appears was especially convened by the moderator, with the concurrence of George C. Wood and Cyrus Nicholas, ministers, and David Clark and A. O. Nash, elders, for the purpose of considering the case presented in the memorial and sundry documents from the elders of the church of St. Charles. Its meeting took place at Greenfield on the 5th June, 1835. Rev. David Nelson, moderator, Geo. Co, Wood and Sam'l C. M'Connell, ministers; Joseph Lafon, Thomas Lindsay, John M'Affee and James D. Mahan, elders. The memorial and documents were read, and a testimony of Messrs. Lindsay, Black and Copes (witnesses present) was heard, and then the Presbytery adjourned to meet the next day at 4 P M. Met according to adjournment, present as on yesterday. Brethern, George Slaven and S. M. Grant, appeared and took their seats as members. The Presbytery having duly considered the case, passed the following acts declaratory, and then adjourned.

It was "Resolved, that members in full communion vote for their Pastors and officers, and that such only receive the censures of the church." "That a respectable minority should never be coerced by the majority, in any case, unless reasons existed which are vital and insurmountable. We should consider a third or a fourth part of a church a respectable minority. During the prosecution of a call, the presiding minister, to prevent coercion of minority, should interpose timely and earnest dissuasion. We should suppose that the spirit in the bosom of the Ambassador of Peace, which urges dissuasion must at the same time prohibit his acceptance of a call to a contested field. It seems to us that nothing short of actual incarceration of body would detain a minister like Paul, on litigated ground. Persecution from the world is to be sustained and disregarded; but conscientious opposition from God's covenant people, is a voice of a different tone. We have been unable to hear of the calling of any assembly, or the election of any officers which has been done ( as seems to us ) in compliance with the Presbyterian rule, and in strict conformity to our discipline.--- That this Presbytery do, in the fear of God, earnestly request Mr. Chamberlain to retire from the troubled region; and moreover, that they do not recognize his act in electing new elders."

3. On Sabbath, June 14," says the record, "immediately after the morning service, Mr. Chamberlain presented to the congregation of St. Charles, the act of the Presbytery of St. Charles, of June 6, received by him June 11. The session presented to the congregation an appeal from said act for their consideration. Whereupon it was resolved;" &c

It appears that when Mr. Chamberlain presented the act of the Presbytery to "THE CONGREGATION OF ST. CHARLES" and when the SESSION presented an appeal from said act for their consideration, that Mr. C. commented largely and severely on the several decisions of that body, and the testimony on which they were founded; complaining of injustice and oppression to himself and the church and congregation. That after he had made an end of speaking, the congregation consented to sundry resolutions declarative of the general views presented by Mr. Chamberlain in his speech, especially the determination "to adhere to, and maintain the principles by which we were governed in the election of our present Pastor, and the additional officers of this church;" and concluding thus:-- "Therefore, resolved, that we appeal and authorise the officers of this church, Messrs. Cayce, Campbell and Wardlaw, a committee to prepare in due form, and forward in due time, an appeal to the Synod of Missouri."

4. "The congregation of St. Charles," present on this occasion, was by no means numerous. A considerable portion were mere lookers on, attracted by the novelty of the scene, and took no part whatever in the proceedings. Very few, except church members, thought themselves entitled to interfere in Mr. Chamberlain's controversy, with the Presbytery; and several of those members who joined in passing the resolutions, were not entitled to vote as members of the church of St. Charles. The scene exhibited, was of such a character, as to strike many of the auditors with pain and surprise; for though all the proceedings were in themselves orderly, there existed a feeling of repugnance, to some extent, to the transaction of SUCH BUSINESS on the Sabbath day---a day which should ( as the writer humbly conceives ) be wholly appropriated by every minister and congregation to the preaching and hearing the Gospel of Peace, to the utter exclusion of secular business, and especially such as might be expected to rouse the passions and foment strife and controversy among professing Christians.

5. The appeal is dated the same day (June 14) and is signed "in behalf of the congregation," by Alex. B. Campbell, P. Cayce and B. R. Wardlaw; who style themselves "The ruling elders, and authorised representatives of a large and respectable majority of the church of St. Charles." The document, which is of considerable length, is believed to have been drawn up by Mr. Chamberlain himself: it is certain that he has recognised as his own, its reasoning and general tenor and design, in a separate note addressed by him, on the same day, to the Synod. Every position assumed by the Presbytery in their declaratory act, is controverted in this appeal. The act is earnestly and solemnly complained of as being "most unjust and oppressive

in its bearing on this society, and on the labors of a loved and cherished ambassador of Christ.", and as having for its design to injure a minister of the Gospel and his supporters,"-- The appellants complain that they were TRIED and condemned on exparte testimony, and that they were not notified of the TRIAL, and had no opportunity of defence. That the decision of the Presbytery is "founded in mistake and injustice," which they, the appellants could have proved, if they had been allowed a hearing. This appeal contains some very severe reflections upon the session of St. Charles, and those who support their authority; charging against THEM, that though a MINORITY, they had for several years imposed on them, the appellants, "an oppressive yoke," which they could bear no longer--that they had been guilty of misrepresentation, slander and forgery, and exercised unwarrentable power.

Such is Mr. Chamberlain's appeal to the Synod. It is to regretted exceedingly, that SUCH a paper, so charged with angry vituperation and bitter recrimination, should ever have been sanctioned by "an ambassador of Christ" and submitted on the Sabbath day to his waiting congregation for their approval. Who can for a moment doubt the deleterious influence of such "preaching of the Gospel of Peace," (see Chap. V., P. 3) in a community where the torch of discord and strife had already been thrown?

6. The stated meeting of the Presbytery of St. Charles took place at Salem Grove, on the 9th day of October 1835. "In relation to the St. Charles difficulties," the following is recorded:- "The Presbytery having learned with deep regret, that the difficulties in the church of St. Charles still continue to exist, and with no prospect (as long as the present causes of strife continue there) of being restored to peace; Resolved, 1st, that the Rev. Hiram Chamberlain be, and is hereby required to cease his ministrations among that people. 2d. That the disaffected members of said church be affectionally recommended to return to the watchful care of the existing session. If they have any grievances they be advised to apply to the constitutional authority of the church for redress. 3d. That the session be and hereby directed to take such constitutional steps as they may deem necessary to restore peace and order to the church.-- 4th. That the stated clerk furnish a copy of the resolutions to the elders of said church, to be read to its members as soon as practicable, in some public meeting. Also, that he furnish Rev. H. Chamberlain with a copy of them."

7. The Synod of Missouri held its annual meeting at Marion College from the 15th to the 21st October 1835, inclusive. The appeal of Mr. Chamberlain and his elders, coming up for consideration, was "dismissed as informal, and unconstitutionally made", because of the act of the Presbytery appealed from was DECLARATIVE and not JUDICIAL, and therefore not an appealable case. But Mr. Chamberlain was allowed to present his whole case in another form, and then the subject was fully enquired into and judgment given.

The reader should be apprised that Mr. Chamberlain's session had appointed Mr. Alex. B. Campbell their "delegate to the Presbytery at Salem," and that the appointment was not recognised by that body, and Mr. Campbell refused a seat. Whereupon Mr. Campbell complains to Synod and asks redress. And also, that an appeal and complaint was laid before Synod by Mr. Chamberlain against the act of Presbytery of the 9th October (see P. 6) signed by H. Chamberlain, A. B. Campbell, William Spencer, "minister and ruling elders of the church of St. Charles," assuming the general reasons contained in the appeal of June 14th, together with others specified by them.

8. The final judgment of synod on these several complaints, was not pronounced until after a patient and full investigation of the testimony laid before them. In addition to much documentary evidence, Mr. Chamberlain introduced several witnesses who testified in person; and Mr. C. was heard at large, and at considerable length, in support of the several appeals and complaints. The parties consented to submit all the papers relating to the several complaints to the Synod for their decision without further remark or debate. "The Synod then retired to consult and deliberate

in private, previous to coming to a decision. After some time thus spent in private, the Synod decided unanimously, that the complaints be not sustained. A committee, consisting of Brethern, Brown, Mc Afee and Lovejoy, was appointed to prepare a minute to be spread upon the records of Synod concerning this decision. The committee reported, and their report was accepted. "

The following extracts from the report, which is quite long and impressive, will be sufficient to afford the reader all the information needful, touching Mr. Chamberlain's persevering contest for supremacy, with the session of the church. "Synod emphatically declare, they have seen nothing in all the proceedings before them, that does in the least degree implicate the moral character or purity of motive of any individual concerned. And they desire especially and particularly to apply this remark to the MINISTERIAL character and standing of Brother Chamberlain---they are both unimpeached." The report expresses the opinion that a petition signed by a majority of the members, was presented to the session, &c., and that if the session had evidence that a majority of members HAD signed it, their duty was, to have called the meeting requested; "and in case of their refusing, the remedy of the majority was in a complaint to Presbytery." "It is an evidence, that a meeting of the church of St. Charles was called by an individual member of the session, without concurrence of the other three members; at which meeting it was resolved to choose three additional elders, which was subsequently done. This act Synod judge irregular and void, because the session does possess the power of convening the church; whereas, in this case, while there were four acting elders, this meeting was called by ONE in opposition to the THREE, and it is in evidence, that a majority of the church did not vote for the additional elders. It follows, of course, that all the acts of these new elders, purporting to be the acts of the session of the church of St. Charles, including the proceedings had in inviting Mr. Chamberlain, are irregular. Finally, in view of all the circumstances of the case, Synod would most affectionately advise Brother Chamberlain to seek another field, of labor than St. Charles." "To the members of the St. Charles church, of both parties, synod recommend forbearance, forgiveness, and earnest endeavors by mutual confessions and explanations, to come together again: and carefully avoid all re- criminations; hereafter to live harmoniously, as Brethern having "ONE LORD, ONE FAITH, ONE BAPTISM."

Thus terminated Mr. Chamberlain's several complaints to the Synod.--That tribunal affirmed most unequivocally the judgment of Presbytery in annulling the election of Mr. C's new elders, and all their acts; and unite with the Presbytery in the opinion that he ought to seek some other field than St. Charles, which they affectionately advise him to do.

9. But Mr. Chamberlain was influenced by other counsel. On the very next day he appealed from the judgment of the Synod to "the General Assembly of the Presbyterian church, to be convened at Pittsburgh, in May, 1836"--where his appeal is yet pending. This paper is of very great length, and has appended to it the names of "H. Chamberlain, A. B. Campbell, P. Cayce, B. R. Wardlaw, and Wm. Spencer," who entitle themselves "minister, in the character of stated supply, and ruling elders in the church of St. Charles." The appellants complain of grievous oppression under the judgment of Synod---that it deprives a minister of his people, and DISROBES three ruling elders, duly and regularly elected and ordained. And they set forth their case with reasons and arguments, many and various; controverting every material position taken by Synod. A few only of the specifications contained in the appeal need be noticed in this sketch, and those only very briefly.

10. Sixteen reasons are assigned by Mr. Chamberlain for his appeal to the General Assembly; in which he constantly assumes as a fact, that he and his elders are the real and only representatives by a "very large and respectable majority"-- that the old session and their adherent, are a small minority acting as a DISSIDENT party in the church, and in rebellious opposition to Mr. C. and THE CHURCH; pro-

ducing strife and disturbance, by false statements, and the array of negro slaves against them. And Mr. C. concludes by telling the General Assembly that he cannot obey the judgment of Synod without yielding the rights of a large majority into the hands of a minority and **DISROBING** his new elders, which he declares ought not and cannot be done, even to gratify his earnest desire for peace, &c.; and he finally demands, that the General Assembly give directions for organising his opponents as a **NEW CHURCH**.

11. This is truly a most extraordinary document and its extravagant pretensions could scarcely fail to excite the risibility of those who set them forth with such apparent gravity. As to Mr. Chamberlain's "**LARGE majority--CLEAR majority--VERY LARGE majority,**" of which he so often speaks, it is altogether a mistake. The real truth as to that matter, as nearly as can now be ascertained, the reader will find by turning to chap. IV., P. 7, 9, 10, 11--chap. V., P. 4, 7,--chap. VI., P. 4. Mr. C. has certainly been laboring under a total misapprehension of facts on this point, and has been the means, it is believed, of leading several strangers into unpleasant mistakes, as to the actual session of this church; inducing the belief that he and his new session are really and truly "**the church of St. Charles,**" fully competent to admit members on certificate or otherwise; when as has been fully shown in the proceedings pages, such never was the case; so far from it, that the Presbytery and Synod declare Mr. C. and his session disorderly, and all their acts as such, void. And it may not here be amiss to enquire whether Mr. Chamberlain and his immediate associates ( his session ) have not placed themselves in an attitude very like defiance, towards the law of the Presbyterian church? The constitution of said church ( edition of 1821, ) contains, in the section of appeals, page 450, the following sentence: " if a sentence of suspension, or excommunication from church privileges, **OR OF DEPOSITION FROM OFFICE** be the sentence appealed from, it shall be considered as in force until the appeal shall be issued." And yet Mr. C. and his new session, altho' the new elders were deposed by the Presbytery and Synod; or what is just the same in effect, their appointment declared void; have continued to act, and to style themselves "**the session of the church of St. Charles.**"

The church of St. Charles consists of its officers constitutionally appointed, and its members regularly admitted through the session; and no others. Those of the church, who employ Mr. Chamberlain, attend his preachings, and encourage him to stay at St. Charles, contrary to the known sentiments of their session, Presbytery and Synod, are without any doubt acting disorderly and unlawfully as **PRESBYTERIANS**; and can only be considered a dissident part or party of the church--even if they **ARE** " a large and respectable majority," as it is pretended they are. And Mr. C. himself can be viewed in no other relation than as an unsettled minister striving to force admittance into and **OVER** his church, contrary to repeated advice, entreaties and remonstrances of many of his brethren in the ministry, of private members, the elders individually, and as the session; the Presbytery of St. Charles, and Synod of Missouri; and in the full knowledge that there are not less than fifty respectable individuals in this little community, who consider his **STAY** here as intrusive, and as tending to promote the strife that his **COMING** here was the cause of engendering. It is very true, that several respectable and worthy citizens of St. Charles, until recently have, contributed to the support of Mr. Chamberlain, who think highly of him and of his preaching--but they are not Presbyterians, and but few of them professing christians. Some of them are in truth open and violent enemies of the Presbyterian church, and are not sorry to witness the shameful confusion that has for the last two years been kept up in this church. In his ministerial labors and ordinary intercourse with the people, Mr. C. is believed to be quite void of offence. But there is no denying the fact, that his presence

-22-

in the community, has determined perseverance to establish himself here as our PASTOR, his known hostility to the existing session; and affecting constantly to consider himself and the new session THE church, and actually usurping powers corresponding with such strange pretensions; have encouraged and still do encourage and foment a spirit of disorder and wild confusion in the church, that are ruinous to its peace, and fatal to its important interests. More than two years have now been spent in these sinful contentions--the time and talents of Mr. C. have been worse than wasted HERE, whilst there are so many destitute places where he would doubtless have been cordially received, and where his presence might have greatly promoted his Master's service, instead of its being "the occasion of much strife and disturbance" here at St. Charles. It is greatly to be hoped that the General Assembly will speedily and decisively act on Mr. Chamberlain's appeal. He seems to consider himself not only at liberty, but under some kind of moral obligation to protract his stay here whilst there remains any right of appeal; and it is utterly impossible for the church to recover its peace and to prosper, whilst he allows himself to arrogate and exercise rights and powers forbidden by the constitution and the Synod.

12. There does not exist the slightest evidence to justify Mr. Chamberlain's charge against this church, that its colored members who are slaves have ever voted or been in any manner arrayed against him. Those members are unobtrusive, and not at all apt to claim the right to vote, and have never done so, or been urged to do so, during the troubles of the last two years---indeed no occasion has been presented within that period to require any expression of their sentiments in relation to the affairs of the church. Mr. C. claims for the members of his congregation, who are not members of the church, the right to vote for a minister---and on this point, he and the Session and the Presbytery are fairly at issue. To the General Assembly it belongs to decide upon this question, and to pass an Act declarative of the true construction of the law on the subject. The last, though not the least extraordinary, of Mr. C's. lofty views, is his proposition to organize his opponents at St. Charles as a NEW CHURCH, with the RIGHT TO ENJOY THEIR PRIVILEGES. To the very last, he perseveres in holding himself and his elders up as THE church, although the Synod had told him of his error, only the day before he wrote his last appeal. It is believed that on Mr. C's departure this unfortunate little church will recover its peace, and that its members, with perhaps a few exceptions will be fully re-united. And in that event, its increase MAY at some future day justify a peaceable division. There is nothing however in the existing circumstances of its affairs, to call for, or warrant such a measure.

13. It ought to have been mentioned before this, that in the spring of the year 1835, the session personally visited the members of the church generally; and especially such as they considered to be in need of their counsel and advice, touching the choice of a minister. This they no doubt believed to be their solemn duty in reference to the disturbance then becoming seriously alarming in consequence of Mr. Chamberlain's exertions to obtain the pastoral office. For this act they are very severely criticised by Mr. C., and are charged with their being tyrannical and oppressive. But really there would seem to be much better cause for complaint, if the elders had neglected this peculiar and very important duty; and it is much to be lamented, that such was already the influence of the spirit of confusion, over the minds of SOME of the members, as to produce a degree of unkindness towards their friendly visitors, that was incompatible with even the ordinary forms of civility.

#### CHAPTER VII.

##### Visit of Rev. W. P. Cochran--Proceedings of St. Charles and Missouri Presbyteries---Conclusion.

1. The Presbytery of St. Charles thought proper to delegate one of their body to visit this church with the view of ascertaining the precise nature of the existing difficulties with Mr. Chamberlain, and of assisting the Session in carrying into effect their THIRD resolution of the 9th October, ( see ch. VI, P. 6) and also to administer the sacrament of the Lord's Supper. Their commissioner, the Rev.

Wm. P. Cochran, made his visit early in February, 1836, and spent about ten days in the execution of the duties assigned to him. His reception at St. Charles, was kind and respectful, except by a few of the most zealous of Mr. Chamberlain's supporters; by some of whom he was treated with studied incivility; for which they had no other reason or apology than Mr. Cochran's assisting the Session as Moderator to call up two members to answer charges of improper conduct, and for passing sentences of suspension from church privileges against them on their contumacious refusal to answer. The reasons given for their refusal, as officially communicated by Mr. Chamberlain and HIS Session were, that the charges alluded to, had been already answered, and judgment given thereon, in Mr. C.'s session, and that the members were not lawfully amenable twice for the same offence. It ought to be recollected, that this action of Mr. Chamberlain, in direct opposition to the authority of Presbytery, took place AFTER the Synod had DEPOSED his new elders from office, and dissolved his connection with them as A SESSION; and was consequently an act of usurpation, and in violation of the settled law of the Presbyterian church. Of course then Mr. Cochran and the elders of the church who acted with him in these unpleasant scenes, could not regard Mr. Chamberlain's decisions and interferences in the cases before them, as any justification, were they to neglect their own duty in the premises. They therefore proceeded, as has already been stated; not however without some personal danger to the commissioner, as appears from the testimony of Mr. Chamberlain, who takes occasion in one of his publications to allude to Mr. Cochran's visit and to these acts of his; which he says "caused so strong a burst of public indignation, that many fears were entertained of his personal safety". The danger to which Mr. Chamberlain here alludes, was a reported threat that some of the friends and supporters of HIS church and session, intended to administer to Mr. Cochran the popular remedy of LYNCHING, for what had been ALREADY done in the two cases mentioned, and to PREVENT his further action in them. There is too much reason to believe that such a threat had actually been uttered, with serious intentions of attempting its execution. Mr. Cochran was warned of it; but either disbelieved or disregarded it. Fortunately for the credit of all concerned, no movement was made to interrupt the Session in their proceedings: they met agreeably to appointment, finished the unpleasant business before them, and adjourned. As Mr. Chamberlain appears to have been apprised of the danger that threatened Mr. Cochran, and was in St. Charles at the time, it is doubtless a fair and reasonable inference, that he interposed his influence to suppress it: for how could a Presbyterian clergyman refrain from exerting all his powers to prevent so gross an outrage on a Brother who was in the discharge of duties as the representative of the Presbytery of St. Charles?--duties that interfered with no man's lawful rights.

2. At the stated meeting of the Presbytery of St. Charles, in April, 1836, Mr. Chamberlain renewed the application that he had once or twice made before, to obtain admission into that body as one of its members: but he was not successful; the Presbytery for reasons that to them appeared sufficient, did not think it fit to admit him. Among the reasons assigned for this refusal, was Mr. C.'s alleged disturbance of peace of this church. This, with several other allegations against Mr. C. in the form of charges, was submitted to the Missouri Presbytery, to which Mr. Chamberlain still belonged, for investigation and judgment. As those OTHER charges have no immediate relation to the subject of this narrative, it will be out of place to speak of them here. The charge of disturbing the peace of this church does not appear to have been so thoroughly investigated by the Presbytery as was requisite to enable them to pronounce a just judgment upon it. This defect, is believed, was the consequence of the omission by the other Presbytery, to designate and furnish all the testimony in their power, and to appoint some fit person to attend to the case whilst under examination. On the part of the Missouri Presbytery, there was certainly manifested every disposition to discharge themselves faithfully of their duty, to the extent of their ability, but for the reasons already stated, they were unable to elicit many of the existing facts having a very material bearing on the subject. The Presbytery have pronounced and published their judgment on this charge, which is probably just such a decision as might reasonably have been



expected under the existing circumstances; and just such an one as cannot be satisfactory to either party. It has been promulgated in the following words:--

"It is clearly in evidence that the peace of the St. Charles church is disturbed, and VERY MUCH disturbed. We are of opinion, too, that the GOING and BEING ther of the accused, have been the occasion of much strife and disturbance; but it is not in proof that the accused in the GUILTY cause of all or any of these consequences. The Presbytery have sought industriously for that act of the accused from which GUILT in this particular can be inferred, but have sought in vain. An examination of the immense mass of testimony, which we have with labour, and much expense of time and trouble taken, will convince any mind capable of investigating such a subject impartially, that there is no such solitary act."

3. This decision of the Presbytery, whilst it fully affirms the fact charged against the accused; not only omits to offer any remedy for the ADMITTED evil already inflicted, or any security for the future; but on the contrary, it virtually consents to the continuance of the disturbance through the same agency, by exonerating from all blame, the brother who CONFESSEDLY occasioned it.

Admitting the accused to have been perfectly blameless; that he neither did or said any thing whatever to originate or foment the strife and disturbances complained of, except allowing himself to go and BE at St. Charles, still it does, at least to the writer of this, seem quite reasonable and just, that the Presbytery should have REQUIRED or at least REQUESTED their wandering brother "to retire from the troubled region," where his MERE PERSONAL PRESENCE is by them admitted to be the occasion of so much trouble in the church. For it might rationally be enough apprehended, that one so unfortunate as to CREATE strife, merely by GOING to, and BEING at the St. Charles church, would be quite likely to INCREASE that strife very much, if he should at any time be thrown off his guard, and be betrayed, however innocently on his part into some overt act against the constituted authorities of that church. Or should a being so obviously unwelcome, allow himself, through persuasion of others, tho' entirely repugnant to his own quiet and passive disposition, to be invested with office, and to usurp powers in defiance of Presbyterian law, and in contempt of the special decisions of the higher tribunals; what else than utter CONFUSION with its usual attendants, strife and disturbance, very HIGHLY AGGRAVATED; could be expected from such PASSIVE indiscretion? Such acts as are here ( Supposititiously ) instanced, would, if perpetrated by one enjoying unbounded popularity; whose mere personal presence was usually persuasive of peace and concord, instead of being the innocent occasion of strife; would most assuredly ruin the peace and unity of ANY church, and utterly destroy the influence for good, of ANY minister who should suffer himself to become thus involved.

The reader will remark, that the Presbytery, and the writer of this sketch, are not precisely agreed as to the fair and just inferences to be drawn from the testimony upon which the judgment of the Presbytery is founded. The writer believes, that after the full admission that Mr. Chamberlain was disturbing this church, the Presbytery ought to have used their authority in our behalf; whether any guilt or criminality, or blame might or might not attach to the conduct of Mr. C., was not a question presented. The church of St. Charles, the writer has every reason to believe, do no entertain one sentiment or feeling or personal hostility towards Mr. Chamberlain. They are perfectly well convinced, that their lost peace and unity can never be restored, whilst he persists in his mistaken course; and therefore they earnestly desire his withdrawal. They are sincere in the opinion that Mr. C. can never effect any good HERE in his ministerial character, but have no doubt there are many destitute places, where his labours would be welcome, without opposition, and might be greatly blessed; and therefore they desire him, in the language affectingly addressed to him by the Synod of Missouri, "to seek another field of labor than St. Charles."

4. Mr. Chamberlain appears to labor under an impression that his "opponents" in St. Charles church area an organized PARTY, and that they have, in that character, made charges, and circulated them, with the intent to injure and destroy his private character. This is believed to be an entire misconception; there is no **proof** that any such attempt was ever made, or wish harbored to do an injustice or injury to Mr. C. When he came to St. Charles, there were already in circulation, certain reports against him, and as is usual, there was some diversity of opinion expressed about them--the FACTS were not known, and Mr. Chamberlain had purposely omitted to refute the stories reported. There were some two or three individuals, it is true, with whom Mr. C. was in personal controversy ( against one of whom he even published very bitter aspersions ) who openly expressed opinions unfavorable to him as founded on those reports, and most probably believed them true; and there were others, who inclined to credit them. But there is no reason to believe that there is a single individual member of the church who would not rejoice to be fully convinced of Mr. Chamberlain's perfect purity of character in all things. Such reports as Mr. C. suffered to circulate against him unrefuted, for years before he came to St. Charles in 1835, were certainly enough of themselves, to startle christian strangers when called upon to form a close and hasty connection with him; and if they shrunk from the contact FOR THAT REASON, it was evidence of an honest impulse, and NOT proof of an uncharitable spirit. The relation that a Pastor bears to a church, collectively and individually, is of a nature THAT ABSOLUTELY REQUIRES MUTUAL CONFIDENCE, and it is even more necessary, in order to effect the important objects of such a union, that the minister's personal character should not only be pure and irreproachable in fact; but believed to be so by those who are about to commit their best interests, so much to his keeping. But it would be a hopeless undertaking, ever to reconcile this church to Mr. Chamberlain, even if there were no extraneous influence operating; there exists an inherent, mutually repulsive, influence; so positively immoveable and insurmountable, that were Mr. C. believe by all to be as pure as Caesar's wife, and to possess the learning and talents of St. Paul, it would prevent the union.

5. The writer has endeavoured to avoid unnecessary prolixity in this narrative; and has studied to present the reader a true and faithful view of facts, in their natural order and connection; and he thinks it probable that the most of those who are interested in the subject may be able to satisfy their minds and to determine in the fear of God and their consciences, what they ought individually to do, in order that peace and unity and christian fellowship may be speedily restored to the church of St. Charles; AND TO DO IT.

The "immense mass of testimony" from which this relation has been chiefly compiled is of a nature so confused and irregular; so utterly void of arrangement, and withal so burdened with matter irrelevant, that it ought not to be at all surprising to any one, that the Presbytery should have been unable to reach the true merits of the whole subject; the more especially, as much important testimony was withheld, and some excluded.

The writer, who is also a member of this church, positively disclaims any PARTY connection or party feeling whatever in these affairs; and every motive capable of misleading his judgment in any degree; and he assures the reader, that in the course of this narrative, prepared amidst many interruptions, he is unconscious of having.

"Aught extenuated, or aught set down in malice."

St. Charles, Missouri, April, 1837.

The following cut from the St. Charles Clarion, of 29th April, 1837.

Mr. Patten,

An anonymous pamphlet, just printed at your office, has been put into my hands. It purports to be a faithful narrative of facts; but seems calculated to mislead the minds of some, in relation to important particulars, which may be made to appear from the RECORD ITSELF. The NAME of the real, responsible Author is therefore respectfully called for.

H. CHAMBERLAIN.

(The Editor understanding that Mr. Chamberlain would leave the State, on his way to the Presbyterian General Assembly, at Philadelphia, before the publication of the next Clarion, offered to the author of the pamphlet the privilege of replying to the above in the present number. The following is his answer:)

Mr. Patten is hereby authorized to answer Rev. Mr. Chamberlain's request, by informing him that I am the real and responsible author of the pamphlet he alludes to, and that I shall be ever ready to acknowledge and to correct any errors therein contained, when made sensible of them, inasmuch as it is my sole aim and desire to establish and set forth the simple truth in regard to the matters discussed in said pamphlet.

G. C. SIBLEY

Friday morning, 24th April, 1837.

The undersigned has carefully perused the foregoing Narrative included under seven heads of chapters, entitled The Presbyterian Church of St. Charles, Missouri, it's Recent History Strife and Disturbance. Thro' a personal knowledge of many of the facts, and also thro' testimony elicited in the case, I do believe said narrative to be substantially true, forming a concise and correct narrative of the multifarious troubles which have assailed our church since the first of January, 1835.--Some items in the 1st chapter being taken from memory, after a lapse of eight years ( as to some of them ) are found to be not entirely correct in some particulars.

(Signed) S. S. Watson, Elder.

I fully concur with my brother as to the narrative excepting the 3rd chapter, to which I have serious objections."

(Signed) Thomas Lindsay, Elder.

St. Charles, April 26th, 1837.

---

Note: The errors alluded in the above testimonial are:--

First--As to the date of the decease of Rev. M. Robinson, in the 2<sup>d</sup> paragraph; which is a mistake of the press, and was corrected with a pen in every copy--( 1828 instead of 1835)

Second --In the 5th paragraph, 2<sup>d</sup> page, M. Watson is named as an Elder instead of M. Cayce--This is a mistake of the writer, of which he was apprised by Mr. W., but too late to be corrected before printing.

The protest mentioned in this 5th paragraph was signed by M. Watson, not as an Elder, and 4 others, as Stated.--Apr. 20, '37.

G. C. S.

---

A few brief remarks in reference to the following printed pamphlet, pages 27 to 34.

I cordially agree with Mr. Chamberlain in reprobating the too common practice of publishing charges against individuals, especially ministers of the Gospel, unnecessarily--

Page 30--Mr. C. is mistaken in supposing all the witnesses except three to be "Partisan"; the three that he excepts were quite as much so as the others.

Page 31--The Second charge--See page 122 for particulars notices of this charge.

Page 31--The 5th charge ( the 7th in the pamphlet ) See full notices, pages 121 to 128. So to "Majorities", See index page 436 for references.

Page 32--Threat against Rev. F. R. Gray--Not much regarded by Mr. G., as will appear by reference to his testimony, pages 123-124 in which he plainly avers the truth of the charge.

Mr. C. quotes from the minute of the Synod partially, omitting to notice the particulars that concern his continuing at St. Charles, &c.

R E P L Y

of

A M I S S O U R I P R E S B Y T E R,  
TO CHARGES PUBLISHED AGAINST HIM, ON THE GROUND OF COMMON FAME,  
AND WITHOUT TRIAL, BY THE PRESBYTERY OF ST. CHARLES.

---

The Missouri Republican of May 5th has the following note:  
"TO THE PUBLIC"

1. The last "St. Louis Observer" contains an assault on my character, in jurious to me as a man, as a citizen of this community, and a minister of the gospel of Christ. To me, as to all, character is valuable; and this publication, I deem, requires prompt and efficient notice. Such notice it shall receive on my return from Pittsburgh, where I am now going, as a delegate to the General Assembly from the Presbytery of Missouri. Until I am fairly heard in my own defence, I request a generous public to suspend their judgment. This will be just to me, and honorable to themselves.

H. CHAMBERLAIN.

2. St. Louis, May 5th, 1836.

This brief note was replied to, by an anonymous letter, whose ignoble effort, with all others of his class, I pass in silence.

3. But the published records of the Presbytery, which has no jurisdiction over me, are widely different. I would silently pass them--would most gladly cast a mantle over the faults of all my brethren--and would hide them forever. But self-defence is an imperious law our nature. When wantonly assailed, every man must yield a right loyal obedience, or be driven from among his peers, as a pusillanimous wretch. I avoid the alternative, and cheerfully submit to this law. I must do violence to my very being, if I did not. B ut NECESSARILY SELF DEFENCE is the only ground which I propose to occupy. Farther than this, I will not expose the faults of others.

4. When a public effort is made to blast the reputation of a citizen, without trial and without a hearing; when the condemnatory records of a judiciary are published to the world, with no other basis than rumor; when every shield of character, and personal happiness is thus torn off and prostrated, the principles of the American Constitution are outraged, and every man is interested in the result. I f the citizen so treated is a minister of the gospel, the government of the church is trampled on, in its most obvious rules; and every other minister, and every member has rights in jeopardy, because the vital principles of the church compact, and of the social compact, are violated, and such violation is a wide spread public evil.

==

June '36, I do not remember what the result was but cannot approve of newspaper attacks.

G.C.S.

5. Under the circumstances, I believe that the minister, churches and people of Missouri, will bear with me, and sympathise with me, while I set before them the grievances of which I complain, and appeal to their sense of public justice, and individual right. I do this with entire confidence, because I have found by an extensive intercourse, and a ten years' residence among them, that their love of character and liberty is ardent, and their abhorrence of persecution, is strong. If the facts, in the case will show, that I have been unjustly assailed in a public journal, I can anticipate the award of their judgment. Well and I assured it will be prompt and efficient, and the AUTHOR of these aggressive acts, will, in the end, have no reason to pride himself on the fruits of his labors, persevering and abundant as they may be.

6. While I am the subject of unmanly attack, and am published in broad sheets over the land as a man of defective veracity, it is proper the public should know, that my standing at this moment, in the Synod and Presbytery of Missouri, is perfectly fair. That I share largely in the confidence and affections of the people of this country, that one entire church is united in my support, and a majority of another continue to cherish me, as the minister of their choice. And these are churches, who have had an acquaintamce with me for the last TEN YEARS. They have known my losses, trials, and labors among them. Why then am I persecuted? Who do my brethern, that live remote and have been a shorter time in this State, now combine to destroy me? Why?

7. The following plain matters of fact, deserve the serious consideration of every reader.

On the 31st of March, 1836, the Reverend John S. Ball, presented in my behalf to the Presbytery of Saint Charles, then in session at Troy, a certificate of "GOOD, REGULAR, AND FAIR STANDING AS A MINISTER OF THE GOSPEL." Whereupon, the Rev. W. P. Cochran, Moderator, left his seat, and opposed my reception. He read a list of injurious and offensive charges against me, and sustained them by broad and vehement assertions. Less privileged, at this bar, than the chained felon, I was permitted no reply to this public and unmanly attack. But the Moderator having resumed his seat, the vote was taken on the motion to receive me, and lost, one minister ~~and~~, Rev. G. C. Wood, and two or more elders voting in opposition to me. Against this high handed and oppressive act, the Rev. John S. Ball, one of the oldest and most venerable of our clergy, entered on the record his solemn portest, remarking that he had known me ever since I had come to the state, and he believe me to be an honest man, and a christian.

#### P R O T E S T

8. The undersigned feels himself constrained to protest against the proceedings and vote of the Presbytery, in the case of Rev. Hiram Chamberlain, upon the presentation of his letter of admission from the Presbytery of Missouri, directed to this Presbytery for admission as a member thereof; and which they have rejected.

The following reasons are assigned for this protest.

9. (1) The letter of dismissal contained full and fair testimony to the moral and ministerial character of the said brother--no objection being made to the letter.

10. (2) That the Synod of Missouri had, during their session last September, at the request of the said Rev. H. Chamberlain, investigated certain, and sundry evil reports, which had been industriously put into circulation, injurious to the moral character of the said brother; and upon his exhibiting evidences of his innocence of those charges did not only express their approbation of the sufficiency of those evidences, but moreover expressed their entire confidence in him as a brother, and in his ministerial character.

11. (3) Because the proceedings of the Presbytery in this case, is conceived to have been made and contrary to the rules of our discipline. Book 2, chap 2. 3d.sec.,

which forbids complaints or information of offences, before those means have been first resorted to which are required by Christ, in Mat. 18, ch. 15, 16; and contrary to that caution which is recommended in chapter 4, sec. 4, and more especially in the case of a gospel minister. See chap. 5, sec. 5 and 6. But a number of accusations, of a highly offensive nature, were made gratuitously by one of the members of Presbytery. Some of which had been decided by Synod, and the brother acquitted thereof; while others for contumacy properly fall under the case now pending before the General Assembly, by appeal wherein the said Rev. H. Chamberlain is the appellant from a decision of the Synod.

12. Finally, the undersigned protests against the vote and proceedings of Presbytery, not only for the injury done the brother in question, who had no opportunity of defending himself, but also for the disrespect which is conceived, a complaint, or charges should have been lodged against the said Rev. H. Chamberlain, in case there had been any charges well founded, and as the said Rev. H. Chamberlain would then have had a fair opportunity of defending himself.

(Signed)

JOHN S. BALL.

13. My certificate of FAIR STANDING was returned, marked "rejected," to the Presbytery of Missouri, then in session at Columbia, April 4th, 1836. On receiving it, they unanimously complained to the General Assembly of the "GROSS DISRESPECT," offered to them by this act; re-asserting in their complaint, that I was "in good, and regular and fair standing." They also appointed me their delegate to the General Assembly by unanimous vote; the Moderator, Rev. J. L. Yantis, voting. Thus they expressed the confidence of the entire body in a persecuted member.

14. Meantime, the Presbytery of Saint Charles, having taken one step in violation of ecclesiastical law, and of individual rights, resolved to proceed in their work--- They accordingly adopted the following paper, and not content with spreading it on their minutes, with all its gross improprieties, to be read, when the frosts of death have swept over us all, they published it to the world.

15. TO THE REVEREND PRESBYTERY OF MISSOURI:

The Presbytery of Saint Charles now in session, in the town of Troy, Lincoln county, do most respectfully present to your Rev. Body that the Rev. Hiram Chamberlain, a member of your Rev. Body, is in our bounds, disturbing the peace of one of our churches, viz: the church of St. Charles, and persisting contrary to our expressed desire and advice, to continue there, to the great detriment of the cause of Christ. We do request your Rev. Body, to take such constitutional steps as shall withdraw the said Chamberlain from our bounds.

16. Further, we would inform your Reverend Body, that the said Rev. H. Chamberlain presented to us a letter of dismissal and recommendation from your Reverend Body, to unite with us, and that we refused to receive said Chamberlain upon the following grounds:

17. (I) The last General Assembly so interpreted the constitution of the Church, as to empower each Presbytery to examine, admit, or reject any Prebyter, who shall ask admission with CLEAN PAPERS from any other Presbytery, as the Presbytery may deem proper.

18. (II) The Book of Discipline, Chap. X. 1-3, expressly declares that no member of the Church, or minister of the gospel, can be tried for offences, that are known prior to his becoming a member of that session, or Presbytery.

18. The following are a list of offences loudly proclaimed by fama clamosa, against said Chamberlain.

19. (I) Mr. Chamberlain's attempt to impose upon the Synod by reading certain papers, now on the file of Synod, and declaring that these covered the whole of his difficulties with Reb. Salmon Giddings; when it is known to some of the members of this Presbytery, that one of the grounds of difficulty occurred in 1827, a year posterior to the date of said papers.

20. (II) Mr. Chamberlain stated to Dr. Graham, Mr. Jordon, and Mrs. Garvin, that Mr. Thomas Lindsay, Sen. had told him that he (said Lindsay) had nothing against him, as a christian minister of the gospel, which said Lindsay and also Mrs. Durfee, ( who was present during their interview,) says is not correct.
21. (III) Mr. Chamberlain told R. F. Gray, that if his name ( i. e. Chamberlain's) had been before the St. Charles Church at the time said Gray was chosen minister, he ( said Chamberlain ) would have had a majority. This is untrue in fact. Mr. Gray told this to Mr. Thomas P. Copes, and Major Sibley.
22. (IV) Mr. Chamberlain stated in Synod at its last session, that Mr. Rob't Spencer, a member of the St. Charles Church, was a reformed man, when Mr. C. certainly knew, or ought to have known, before he made that assertion, that he WAS NOT: Witnesses, Samuel Watson and Wm. Spencer.
23. (V) Mr. Chamberlain stated in Synod that he had nothing to do with the church of St. Charles, other than that of a missionary passing through,&c. until after the election of the NEW ELDERS. When the fact as known is, that he was the prime mover of the whole business, and did actually go through the party of the Church he supposed favorable to his views, and designate the persons proper to be elected. Witnesses, Mr. Garvin, Mr. Jenkins, Members of Synod.
24. (VI) Mr. Chamberlain's disturbin the peace of the St. Charles Church--Witnesses, Elders and Deacons of St. Charles Church.
25. (VIII) Mr. Chamberlain told Mr. Gray that there was but three opposed to him in the St. Charles Church, when he knew, or ought to have known, that that was UTTERLY UNTRUE. Told by Mr. Gray to Thos. P. Copes and Maj. Sibley.
26. (IX) Mr. Chamberlain stated to his congregation on the Sabbath he read the first acts of Presbytery in relation to the Saint Charles difficulties, that the decision of the Presbytery was the result of OLD-SCHOOL prejudices, when Mr. Chamberlain had avowed to Mr. Watson, and others, that he was Old-School in this theology, not six months before. Witness, Thos. Gridley, Samuel Watson, and Mr. Black.

A true copy,

GOE. C. WOOD

Stated Clerk.

27. My first remark on this singular production, is, that it is the work of a party,--The Presbytery is a party opposed to me, and to the people of my charge, in several cases of appeal and complaint, now pending before the Assembly, and continued for final decision, until May 1837. The Rev. Wm. P. Cochran has aided, abetted and led this party as a Moderator of nearly two years standing. His hand is seen as the spider, weaving the web for his victim, in all this business.
28. The witnesses named, also, the exception of Messrs. Graham, Spencer and Jenkins, are partisans. The written charges of this party, I long since met and refuted before my own Presbytery and before Synod. They begin. They make a "common fame" among themselves. Then, without the benefit of a hearing or trial, they publish charges against me over the land, on the ground of such common fame. Who, I ask will receive, without very serious qualifications, such prejudiced and suspicious testimony as this? A good man ought to suspect himself as a witness when so related by ardent party feelings to a pending cause.
29. My next remark is, that some of these statements are UNTRUE, some of them vague and trifling, and some of them may be true, without any fault on my part. Two of them refer to HEAR-SAY TESTIMONY, universally admitted to be the worst in the world. And the whole are thrown together in such a manner as to produce the GENERAL impression, that I am guilty of falsehood.
30. In regard to the FIRST on the list of offences, here published, I have the affidavit of one very respectable witness, and can procure others, equally as good,

to prove that one of my papers presented to the Synod, bears date September 6th, 1827.- Now I am here, and elsewhere in the publication of this Presbytery, charged with UNTRUTH, because my papers did not reach the date of 1827. At whose door, then will the falsehood lie, as charged by them, when we come into an ecclesiastical court?

31. In regard to the second, I will save them the trouble of proof thereof, in part at least; and I now say, what I have before said to Dr. Graham, and others; viz.; that when as a matter of christian duty, I called on Mr. Lindsay in January 1835, and asked him this question, "Have you anything against me as a christian, or minister of the gospel?" I understood him to say, in his usual Scotch dialect, "Nothing in the world." If, indeed, Mr. Lindsay denies the call, the question, or the answer, and appears in court, as a witness against me, I am prepared to meet him ther. Let him come.

32. In regard to the third offence, it is plainly a trifling thing, founded on opinion and supposition, and from the very nature of the case, can never be proven to be a truth or an untruth. I am amazed that the Presbytery should ever bring such a charge against any man. Admit it that I told Mr. Gray, that if I had been a candidate, before the Church of St. Charles, at the time he was, I should have had a majority of votes. This even seems probable. For a clear majority were in my favor in 1827, 1835, and 1836, and are so still. But even if there were none of these facts in the case, who shall accuse? Suppose a citizen should say, that if General Harrison had opposed General Jackson, in his first canvass, General Harrison would have been elected, and the hero of New Orleans driven from the field. And suppose on a charge of expressing such an opinion, a judicatory were gravely to publish that citizen, as guilty of an untruth. How absurdly ridiculous! Now the Presbytery of Saint Charles say, that my opinion of what would have been the result of an election between me and my brother, on the supposition that I had been a candidate "is untrue." How do they know it is untrue? Let them prove it; or let them at least, contrive how they are ever to prove it, before they charge me with a high crime.

33. In regard to the fourth offence, it was insinuated in Synod, that Mr. Robert Spencer, was in fault. I said in an undertone "he has repented of that, we hope." I apprehend this hope has been realised. But suppose it has not. How many hopes are disappointed? And who, of that Presbytery, would wish their veracity impeached, because they had hoped for that which had never happened? What perfect trifling with the character of a man.

34. In regard to the fifth offence, I did made in substance, the statement alluded to, and the assertion that I went through the church, and designated the persons proper to be elected, is UNTRUE, and I can prove this by man witnesses. I did what every minister and missionary has a right to do, I visited the members of a vacant Church, and I asked some of them, who of their number were suitable persons to fill the office of ruling Elder.

35. The seventh offence, as charged, is also erroneous. I have not intentionally, knowingly or willing disturbed the peace of this Church. Some of its members, unhappily, have very much disturbed themselves on my account. But troubles and divisions of this sort, have existed here for several years, and in reference to other ministers. Under the ministry of the lamented Robinson, of Hall, Woods, and Nichols, there were difficulties. And moreover, whether it is proper for me to remain here or not, or in other words, whether a majority shall govern in our church, is a question now before the Assembly in a case of appeal, from what we deem, the unjust, exparte and oppressive acts of this same Presbytery. Until that high judicatory decide, they cannot touch the case. If they do, they are guilty of contempt against the higher court.

36. In regard to the wighth offence, it will be very unfortunate for Mr. Gray, if he should attempt to sustain this statement, made on his authority. For I shall prove by his own letter, that I told him no such thing.



37. The attempt in the ninth and last item, to fix on me the charge of being an Old-School man, or of representing myself to Watson as such, is one of the most weak and preposterous that I have ever met with. At Princeton, at Andover, on my arrival in this state; at Saint Louis, at Saint Charles, in the hearing of Watson himself and of the whole Church; at Boonville, Columbia, in Marion County, and many other places, have I boldly and explicitly proclaimed, what has been denominated "New School doctrine"--the doctrine of a general atonement. That "Christ is the propitiation for our sins, and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world." If to do this, is to be an Old-School man, then do I claim to be ranked as such. For I freely admit, that I am as old as the Bible in this Theological sentiment. But a different distinction has prevailed in our Church, and those who hold the reverse of this, have been generally called Old School men. To this latter class I do not belong. Now have I ever said I did. I love and cherish brethren on both sides of this question, and denounce no man for differing from me in opinion: and so am I the last man in the world to conceal an opinion, which I do hold, as many, who know me, can testify.

38. Such, honest reader, are the circumstances under which a Presbytery have gravely presented me to the public, as a man of "UNTRUTH". They have done it on the precarious ground of rumor--of floating testimony. They have done it, in violation of law, and justice, and with no jurisdiction over me. (See note A.)

Now the civil Constitution of this State, and of the United States, provides that an accused person shall have due notice of trial--shall be heard in his own defence--shall be confronted with witnesses---shall be permitted to introduce witnesses in his favor.---shall have the verdict of impartial men. The Constitution of the Presbyterian Church, equally just and righteous in all its parts, makes similar provisions; and furthermore, especially guards the character of a minister of the gospel who, from his profession, is known to be peculiarly liable to misrepresentation. It also declares---"if any person shall spread the knowledge of an offence, unless so far as shall be unavoidable, in prosecuting it before the proper judiciary, or in the due performance of some other indispensable duty, he shall be liable to censure as a slanderer of his brethren. "

39. The third Presbytery of New York say, in the case of Mc Dowell, "In the judgment of this Presbytery, a most warrantable and unchristian use is made of the public press, in impeaching and censuring individual conduct and character, to a total disregard of the law of Christ, respecting the manner of dealing with those who have offended, and that this great and crying evil, should receive the universal reprehension of the friends and followers of Christ."

40. In cases of high crime, and imprisonment, the public journals also, as a matter of common prudence and propriety, generally abstain from giving the facts to their readers, until they are investigated before a civil court.

If, then, these plain and well settled principles of law and justice are to prevail--and who shall consent that they shall not?---in what language shall we speak of, or in what light shall we view, the act in question? Where is the brotherly kindness, charity, prudence and pious reserve which has characterised the Church, in its dealings with its members? Where is law? Justice? All that is dear and sacred?-- If the charges are true, I have a right to complain. But if, as I am able to show, they are GROSSLY ERRONEOUS, who, beside, would be willing to take upon his shoulders the responsibility of so abusing an innocent brother, laboring for the good of men?

41. They say fama clamosa loudly proclaims this long list of offences. Now I ask, and I have an undoubted right to ask, how can this clamorous fame? Many persons in Saint Charles never heard of some of these charges, until they appeared in print. I myself never heard of some of them, until they were read out, in the Court House at Troy, in the hearing of many, by the Rev. Wm. P. Cochran. Were they not indeed, gathered up by him, from the party, during the ten days visit which he made to this Church this last winter, when he came not near its minister; but did CERTAIN THINGS, which I forbear to name, which nevertheless caused so strong a burst of public

indignation, that many fears were entertained of his personal safety? And were they not, when printed, shown by him privately to the members of the Assembly, in a way suited to prejudice their minds against me?

42. I honestly declare, I wish this brother no earthly harm. I have long known what to expect from him, and been silent. However righteous his course, for the last three years, may appear to the judgment of his own mind, it has more than once reminded me of Saul in the pursuit of the innocent David. He may pursue. I will remember David's example and bear the persecutions of Saul with all meekness and charity. But he shall not destroy me, if I can help it.

43. When charges against me had been widely circulated in 1835, of unchristian conduct towards Rev. S. Giddins, of dishonesty as an agent, of disturbing the peace of the churches, the Presbytery of Missouri took up the subject, at my earnest request, and having examined it to their perfect satisfaction, they say:

RESOLVED, UNANIMOUSLY, That this Presbytery is entirely satisfied, that the said reports are wholly false.

RESOLVED, FURTHER, AND FINALLY, That in view of the whole case, we feel not only authorised, but bound in justice to an injured brother, to express not only undiminished, but entire confidence in his honesty, as a man, and in his faithfulness as a minister. (See note B.)

44. Synod, at their meeting in October last, heard my defence against, substantially the same charges, entered on the files of the Saint Charles Prebytery, and they say, "It is with unfeigned satisfaction, that the Synod emphatically declare, they have seen nothing in all the proceedings before them, that does, in the least degree, implicate the moral character, or purity of motive of any individual concerned, and they desire especially, and particularly to apply this remark to brother Chamberlain---THEY ARE BOTH UNIMPEACHED.

45. Yet in the face of these decisions of my own Presbytery, and of superior judicatory, a Presbytery to which I do not belong, prepare and publish a portion of the same charges, with new matter, and all on the ground of common fame. Whoever heard of such proceedings before in any church? There must be an unwonted anxiety here, to impeach the character of a man. I appeal to that public, before whose bar this subject has been very improperly brought, yet not by me. And I now ask, what public man, what private citizen, what minister of the gospel can be found in this land, so unenvied, so unrepurchased, that an active agent could not find, in the course of ten days' industrious effort and enquiry, from house to house, quite as much matter, for common fame, as would fill her brazen throat? What father, what husband, what man would be willing to have the same experiment tried on him and to the same extent? Suppose it tried on the Moderator, in Franklin, in Columbia, in Palmyra, where he has resided. On Thomas P. Copes, who happens to be very well known to the records of this county, with a fair prospect of having his memory perpetuated.

46. Fellow citizens, I ask justice; and I ask it at your hands. I ask the privilege of standing erect among you, as an honest man and a christian, until some more truthful and responsible personage than that harlot, common fame, pronounces me guilty.

H. CHAMBERLAIN.

Saint Charles, July 11, 1836.

-----

Note A.--Justice to respected brethren who had no share in this business, induces me here to state, that several important members were absent during the session, who, I am persuaded, never would have given their consent to any such measures as those, of which I complain. I also deem it necessary to state, that I have requested the action of my own Presbytery, on these publications.

Note B.--Whereas, it has been reported, that brother H. Chamberlain has been guilty of unfaithfulness in the management of certain funds which have been placed in his hands, by benevolent individuals in the East and West for the purpose of building a house of worship, for the use of the Presbyterian Church of Boonville---and of dishonesty in retaining certain articles of bed clothing, collected by him, as agent of Marion College, for the use and benefit of said College.---and also that the said brother has been instrumental in destroying the peace and harmony of many, if not all, the churches with which he has been connected---and whereas, these reports have extended beyond the bounds of his particular acquaintance, and are calculated to ruin his character as a man and a minister of the gospel of Jesus Christ. It is therefore,

RESOLVED, UNANIMOUSLY, That Brother Chamberlain be permitted in conformity with his own particular solicitation, to produce such evidences of his innocence of the above charges, as he may be able to do, for the purpose of disabusing the minds of his brethren, and relieving his character from all suspicion.

Whereupon, brother CHAMBERLAIN, proceeded to make a statement in relation to all the reports, which statement was amply sustained by satisfactory vouchers. It was therefore,

RESOLVED, UNANIMOUSLY, That this Presbytery is entirely satisfied, that the said reports are wholly false--that in relation to the first and second they feel called upon, in justice to him, to say that he has acted with scrupulous regard to honesty and to his responsibility, as entrusted with the benefactions of the generous--and that in relation to the third, he has been misrepresented and injured, without any cause, and in relation to every charge affecting his moral character, he manifested a perfect willingness to go into judicial investigation, whenever it may be deemed expedient.

RESOLVED, FURTHER, AND FINALLY, That, in view of the whole case, we feel not only authorized, but bound in justice to an injured brother, to express, not only undiminished, but entire confidence in his honesty as a man, and in his faithfulness as a minister.

A true copy of the minutes of the Missouri Presbytery.

R. L. MC AFEE  
Stated Clerk of Presbytery

REV. H. CHAMBERLAIN'S REPLY TO

The "RECENT HISTORY "

OF THE

PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH OF ST. CHARLES, MO.

NOTE: The figures ( 1, 2, 3 &c. ) mark the paragraphs  
of the following pamphlet, as they are referred to in  
the subsequent Review, commencing at page 49.---

MAJOR SIBLEY'S  
CHURCH HISTORY CROSS-EXAMINED

AND PUT TO TEST OF RECORD,

H. CHAMBERLAIN.

1. The reason why I am again before the public is, that I am publicly assailed. And having obtained justice once, I very naturally look for it in this instance. I do so with unwavering confidence, because I have long believed the people of this State ~~is~~ disposed to deal frankly and fairly when differences arise in any quarter: and have already proved them to be quick-sighted and prompt to award a righteous sentence in favor of an injured party, where misrepresentations are employed to subvert plain matters of fact. Perhaps no people were ever more so. The experience, which I, at least have had of this disposition, induces me to trouble them with some BRIEF REMARKS, and INCONTROVERTABLE PROOFS, in reference to the Major's "Recent History." So far as the people of this county are concerned, however, I might well spare myself all that trouble. For the thing has really done nobody any harm with us, that I can ascertain. But it seems necessary to prevent any misapprehension, which may arise in the minds of strangers, from the industrious efforts of a few, disposed if possible, to do me an injury, by means of a printed book. I yield therefore, to a law of nature, which imposes on every man the DUTY of self defence. This duty being discharged, I am perfectly satisfied. I am at peace.
2. It may assist the reader, to premise, that in the summer of 1835, while the writer was busily employed in visiting the sick, during the prevalence of Cholera; certain individuals went up to the Presbytery of St. Charles, then in session near Palmyra, and made such representations to them, of our character and conduct, as led to the passage of a set of resolutions which were deemed highly injurious and oppressive in their bearing on this church. The more so, as the meeting was held without our knowledge. The case went up by appeal to the Synod, and thence to the Assembly of 1836.
3. On the eve of my departure to meet that Assembly, and with a manifest view of prejudicing the minds of the members, and the public generally against me; a list of violent personal charges, made professedly on the ground of "Common Fame" without investigation, were published against me by order of the Presbytery of St. Charles, a body of which Mr. Lindsay was a member, and which had no jurisdiction over me. To sustain these charges the names of G. C. Sibley, Thomas Lindsay, S. L. Watson, and others, were appended. The reader will please note this last fact. I have further use for it.
4. These charges were met by a pamphlet on my return, which to this hour, remains unanswered. They were also, carefully and faithfully investigated in a judicial process before the Presbytery of Missouri, to which I belong.---The result was a unanimous verdict, containing a perfect acquittal. A part of this verdict reads thus: "Presbytery feels constrained to say, that the exhibition of such charges, evinces in our judgment a very censorious fault finding and reprehensible spirit, on the part of those, whoever they may be, that have been engaged in hunting them up." This bitter pill, administered by the solemn sentence of an impartial bench of Judges, my opponents were obliged to swallow, tho' it produced many and strange contortions.
5. The witnesses, Messrs. Sibley, Lindsay and Watson, were not however entirely cured of their desire to testify against me. The verdict had been rendered in November. A long winter was before them. The appeal of the church in which I

was interested, had not been issued in '36, but was pending before the Assembly of '37, to be convened in May. In so great a dilemma something must be done. The Major has leisure. He must write a book.

6. (See ~~paragraph~~ 84 to 86.) Accordingly, when it was too late for me to reply to anything before reaching Philadelphia, an anonymous pamphlet issued from the Clarion press, purporting to be a recent and impartial history of this church. Of this pamphlet, Major G. C. Sibley has publicly acknowledged himself to be the "real, responsible author". I met with it on the Ohio, where it had been conveyed with instructions to distribute copies among members on their way. I found two more in the Assembly, on the Clerk's table, recommended to special notice, by a certificate of Messrs. Lindsay and Watson. The leading object of this distinguished work seems to be, to place ~~me~~ myself, my friends, and the Presbytery of Missouri, in an unfavorable light before the public, and to influence in an unlawful way, the judgment of the supreme Judicatory in regard to our appeal. Why not let justice take its course, and keep the vision of the court clear from the vapor of partisan prints? Why should this vapor be blown in the very face of judgment?

7. ( See ~~paragraph~~ 86 to 91) On the first page of the pamphlet, we are told "the objects in view are---to present the whole subject impartially." Also--- that a "sense of duty constrains the writer to prepare this narrative, after having examined a great mass of testimony, the greater part of which, was obtained from the St. Charles and the Missouri Presbyteries, and the Synod of Missouri----- The facts, proven from these records, together with such as he knows he can prove by competent witnesses, and can verify himself from his own knowledge, will form the basis on which he means to found the following STORY."-- These records here named are now before me. They are my witnesses also. But with what the Major may prove, which has never been proven; when witnesses themselves were anxious; and displayed their anxiety on more occasions than one; when proof was invited; and months were given for them to testify and prove all they could; with what he himself may know, that he did not see fit to testify, when sworn to tell all he knew in the case,--I really have no argument. I take the records of the Judicatories, and ask the reader to examine them.

8. With Major Sibley, I have no private, personal controversy. I never had any personal acquaintance or intercourse with him, except as a witness against me, when he testified of "his impression"--not "his belief". I expect none. I have to do with him, only as the writer of a book. "A sense of duty (will not) constrain" me, here, to sketch his own History, tho' SOME PARTS OF IT might prove interesting. When I speak of him, I am to be understood as dealing with the book, and with that alone. Of this he cannot justly complain, as every man, when he prints, and published--is subject to review.

9. I propose then, here to show the public the moral certainty of the following proposition, viz: That THE BOOK, considered as a history of our affairs, is utterly unworthy the confidence of any man, or body of men. It cannot BE TRUE.

#### PROOFS.

10. 1st. To show his perfect impartiality in writing, and to secure the unsuspecting confidence of the reader, Major Sibley says, page 24--"The writer who is also a member of this church, positively disclaims any party connection, or PARTY FEELING whatever, in these affairs; and every motive capable of misleading his judgment in any degree.

11. The record of Major Sibley's testimony, when under oath as a witness against me, however, says, "This he confesses, that from the beginning he has decidedly disapproved of his official course, since his arrival here, in January, 1835; and has freely expressed, that disapprobation on many occasions, both by words and acts. Quest. When did your opposition to me commence? An s. MANY YEARS

when I heard of the difficulties with Mr. Giddings? He said "twelve years ago", and corrected himself on my suggesting that I had not been so long in the state. Reader, compare these words of the book, denying ANY PARTY FEELING WHATEVER, with the words of the witness---expressing his "disapprobation on many occasions," and avowing an "opposition" which commenced "many years ago," and tell me, can both be true? ( See page 92 to 97 )

12. 2d. Major Sibley says, page 20,--"There does not appear to exist the slightest evidence to justify Mr. Chamberlain's charge against this church, that its colored members, who are slaves, ever voted against him, or been in ANY MANNER ARRAYED AGAINST HIM. Those members are unobtrusive, and not at all apt to claim the right to vote, and have never done so, or been urged to do so, during the troubles of the last two years----indeed no occasion has been presented within that period to require any expression of their sentiments in relation to the affairs of the church." The pamphlet is dated, April, 1837.

13. Now, I have never made any charge against THIS church, and have no controversy whatever with the colored people. I object to nothing, so far as their agency is concerned, but to the use that the party has seen fit to make of their names. I say THE PARTY---because it has been proven that the colored members cannot write. Let the reader know, then, that the record shows two distinct papers used against me before the St. Charles Presbytery. The one signed by TEN, the other by ELEVEN names of colored persons, following the names of white communicants.

14. ( See page 99 to 101) The first is here given in part only, that the reader may judge. It seems to be a stricture on government and ecclesiastical law, and reads thus: "We, the members of the Presbyterian church of St. Charles, who hereunto annex our names, desiring to maintain order and good government," &c. "We, hold that without the consent of Presbytery, no part of the church has any right to set up its own authorities, or withdraw and form a new church, by electing new Elders; causing division and disturbances, &c." A very grave document, certainly, to be signed so! The second paper referred to, reads thus: "Members of the church of St. Charles, opposed to H. Chamberlain, and have subscribed their names to stand by the Elders and Deacons in support of order and good government in our church. St. Charles, May 20th, 1837.

(White names omitted.)

- Sina Symonds, col'd woman;
- Jno Bunyan Lindsay
- Richards, do.
- Letty, do.
- William do.
- Jane, do.
- Milly, do.
- Nelly Collier;
- Abigail Millington;
- Isaac Redman;
- Betsey Sibley;--Black members."

Who now will endorse for the truth of the book, with his eye on these strange papers, received and gravely acted upon?

15. ( Ans? p. 102) 3d. Referring to the appeal of the church, Major Sibley says, (page 16 ) "This appeal contains some very severe reflections upon the session of Saint Charles, and those who support their authority; charging against them that, though a minority, they had, for several years. imposed on them the appellants "an oppressive yoke", which they could bear no longer---that they had been guilty of misrepresentation, slander and FORGERY, and exercised unwarrantable power," Such is Mr. Chamberlain's appeal to the synod."



16. Now as to "slander" I leave any mind to judge, who reads the testimony, But as to "forgery," the word is not to be found anywhere in our appeal. The writer gravely marks it with commas, as a quotation, from the appeal. But it is not there. And it is not anywhere on our papers as charged.---The appeal does say "employed papers with unauthorised signatures," and that fact is proven, I trust, to the reader's full satisfaction, in the paper signed by the names of colored persons, without adding, as might easily be done, from the same paper, the names of white persons, as unauthorised. So the appeal did not charge them with "Forgery." And all the Major's regret at "such a paper", is thrown on a nonentity.

17. 4th. To fix on me the charge of disturbing the peace of Saint Charles Church, is one grand leading object of the pamphlet. It was a leading object of the party, also,--witnesses against me in the prosecution. Their great strength was steadily and vigorously applied here. Major Sibley testifies on his oath and he says he 'KNOWS IT TO BE TRUE'. (Does the reader remember what he says in his book about impartiality?)

18. The Presbytery of Missouri, however, ( Mr. Gray being present and voting, ) after much delay and long and patient investigation, decided this point unanimously as follows:

"It is clearly in evidence that the peace of the Saint Charles Church is disturbed, and very much disturbed. They are of opinion, too, that the going and being there of the accused, have been the OCCASION of much strife and disturbance; but it is not in proof that the accused is the guilty cause of all or any of these consequences. The Presbytery have sought industriously for that act of the accused from which guilt in this particular can be inferred, but HAVE SOUGHT IN VAIN. An examination of the immense mass of testimony which we have, with labor and much expense of time and trouble, taken, will convince any mind, capable of investigating such a subject impartially, THAT THERE IS NO SUCH SOLITARY ACT."

19. Never was there a more triumphant and perfect acquittal, considering the protracted and determined efforts which my accusers had made. But the Major, having sworn that he 'knew the charge to be true', will have it his own way. He gives the verdict above quoted, and then says, page 22-3, "This decision of the Presbytery, whilst it FULLY AFFIRMS THE FACT CHARGED AGAINST THE ACCUSED, not only omits to offer any remedy for the ADMITTED evil, already INFLICTED, or any security for the future; but on the contrary, virtually consents to the continuance of the disturbance through the SAME A G E N C Y, by exonerating from all the blame, the brother, who CONFESSEDLY OCCASIONED IT.--

The writer believes that, AFTER THE FULL ADMISSION, THAT MR. CHAMBERLAIN WAS DISTURBING THIS CHURCH, the Presbytery ought to have used their authority in our behalf."

20. What flagrant injustice! The writer, who either does not understand language, or can so pervert it, truly ought not to write history. Most clearly, Presbytery neither AFFIRM, CONFESS, or ADMIT any such thing as is here represented. They AFFIRM the opposite. They do not say I have OCCASIONED or CAUSED strife. They say that I have been "the occasion", not the "guilty cause." The distinction is perfectly obvious, and altogether important, between being the occasion of an evil, and causing it to be. They "HAVE SOUGHT IN VAIN". and found "NO SUCH SOLITARY ACT," from which it can even be inferred that I have done it. Thus a modest retiring lady, of great worth and spotless reputation may be the occasion of two men shooting each other. So may a timid deer, a noble charger, or a purse of inanimate dollars. Are either of these chargeable with the deed? Will you hang or imprison the estimable lady? Paul was "the occasion" of great commotion at Ephesus. Was he in the wrong? Christ and his apostles were the occasion of very much sinning and wrangling among the people. Were they at fault? Every rational being, every object, in nature, may be made the occasion of sin among evil minded persons. So it is obviously the opinion of Presbytery, deliberately formed and solemnly pronounced that others had me me "the occasion" of much strife and disturbance by their own act.

This is the only fair interpretation that can be given,--otherwise their sentence is without meaning. Had the real authors of this confusion been under the jurisdiction of that body, the blank might have been promptly filled with their names.---- The public might then have been plainly told that -- -- -- had done it. The Major might even have been silent, and his book never seen the light. He must have known that the decision of the Missouri Presbytery was wholly against him, being entirely in my favor, and therefore, labors to invalidate it. Thus, on page 21-2: "The charge of disturbing the peace of this church DOES NOT APPEAR TO HAVE BEEN SO THOROUGHLY INVESTIGATED by the Presbytery, as was requisite to enable them to pronounce a just judgment upon it." But that judicatory, after having devoted much time and labor to the investigation, have thought proper to say, under the sanction of their judicial oaths, and in direct opposition to the charges of our historian, "that in their judgment, ALL THE FACTS HAVE BEEN ELICITED, WHICH ARE IMPORTANT TO THE PROSECUTION; and that it is due to the interests of the church and the accused, that we delay no longer." Ought not this declaration together with the fact, that weeks and months had been devoted to the subject, to satisfy any reasonable mind, and put to silence forever, such cavilling? ( See pages 105-128)

21. The author says, also, of the decision, on page 22, that it is "just such an one as cannot be satisfactory to either party;" yet it has been entirely satisfactory to me, and to my friends, as far as I am able to ascertain. My satisfaction was expressed, when the verdict was rendered, in the presence of the Judicatory, and soon after, publicly, to the congregation to whom I minister.

22. (5) The testimony shows that I did not originate the evil of division-- that there were difficulties in the church long before I came. But our impartial historian labors to prove the contrary. And having said, when a witness, under oath, referring to the state of the church, for the last eight years, that "the peace and harmony were never disturbed to any serious degree, except by the several attempts of Mr. Chamberlain to become its minister." He devotes the first page of his book, to sustain that testimony, and thus speaks of Mr. Wood on page 2: "In the Winter 1830, the Rev. George C. Wood accepted an invitation for a year; at the expiration of which, the session did not renew the invitation. A strong desire was manifested, however, by a considerable majority of both church and congregation to retain Mr. Wood another year. This was FIRMLY opposed by TWO elders, (Lindsay and Watson) and fourteen other members." This opposition produced some excited feeling in the church, and congregation for a short time, but it was soon calmed and peace and harmony restored by the prudent course pursued by Mr. Wood. He knew that it was his duty to retire, and not to seek to enter a church, the doors of which were closed against him, by its sworn guardians."

23. The reader will be surprised, if indeed he CAN be, after the errors already shown, to be here told, that Mr. Watson was not an Elder at all, until some time after these events. But Mr. Thomas Lindsay and Milton P. Cayce were elders. And the latter did not CLOSE THE DOOR, but really was very desirous of keeping it open, and retaining Mr. Woods. Mr. Cayce was a witness in my case. He testifies of his eldership--speaks of removing from his place, and says: "Previous to my removal, and in the year 1832, after Mr. Wood had labored among us for about one year, he was elected by the church for another year. At the time of his election, a division and discussion took place respecting the manner of voting. It was proposed by Mr. Lindsay, to CAST LOTS, and objected to by a large majority, Mr. Lindsay insisted on it, and proposing prayer during the discussion, and the vote was finally taken by ballot. Mr. Lindsay and about four others voting against him. The opposition to Mr. Wood continued until the 20th August, 1832, he (Mr. Wood) wrote to me as follows concerning the divisions of the church: "As we have good authorities for VETOES at the present day, I understand from Mr. Durfee that a paper is

in circulation, the substance of which is to veto against my staying at Saint Charles, on any condition whatever. This paper never originated from any better spirit than that, which was the cause of a papal persecution. Every subscriber well knew that I did not intend to return to this place, and therefore, there was nothing in the nature of things to call forth such a paper. The only construction I can put upon it is a wanton attempt to injure my character, and to destroy my usefulness as a preacher of the gospel. Strange as it may appear, Mr. Burfee told me that eighteen persons had subscribed, and now, dear Sir, I care nothing about it. I know who the 18 are, and shall be very careful not to do anything to injure their feelings by the way of courting their acquaintance, or having anything to do with them, directly or indirectly."

24. "I am sorry for one thing, and that is, that these persons are doing ALL IN THEIR POWER TO DISTURB THE PEACE AND HARMONY OF THE CHURCH, and if they persevere, they will ruin it entirely. This I greatly lament. I have one request to make, and that is, that you get this VETO for me--as it, by its circulation has become an official paper and in all justice belongs to me. When the amount of subscribers is finished, I will suscribe it with all my heart, or that part of it which relates to my not returning, as I never had such an idea." Mr. Wood fulfilled the purpose expressed in this letter, and never returned to be a minister of this church. There were many complaints by the majority, that the few should govern the many, and some threatened to leave the church. The result was MUCH DISSATISFACTION." Such is the testimony of Mr. Cayce, a ruling elder, acquainted with the facts which our Historian is laboring to disprove. Another part of the testimony, referring to this former division reads thus: "Witness had neighbors who were members, as well as others, who were not members, who were sorry at Mr. Wood's leaving; some were so much dissatisfied that they would never come to church since, or sign any paper for its support. Witness also believes the church has never prospered so much since." These extracts from the Records, placed by the side of Major Sibley's History need no comment of mine. ( All ans. p's. 128-130.)

25. (6) To effect the general object of the Pamphlet to sustain his own testimony---and show that I am a disturber of the peace, in opposition to the decision of Presbytery. The author introduces Mr. Gray, at page 3; speaks of the great unanimity in the choice of him, and charges me, on page 6 and 7, with interfering with his prospects here. This point is labored, and it is curious to observe how men will argue. The testimony, however, shows, that there was not perfect harmony when the congregation convened for the election of Mr. Gray. One witness says ' he became dissatisfied and retired.' Another witness testifies "I though there should have been some other nominated, also as the congregation were too much hurried in their solicitations and had not an opportunity of having their choice. I did not like Mr. Gray from what I had heard of his preaching. I determined not to support him if he came." This far famed election was considered by many was merely NOMINAL at the time. It was so spoken of in the testimony. To whom that it was a mere NOMINAL proceeding, a communication from Mr. Gray was made public at the meeting. It is in evidence and reads thus. "The more I have thought, the more I am convinced, I ought not to go there, and ought no to SUFFER MY NAME TO BE USED for that purpose in your congregation, unless there was a strong probability I would accept if invited. This I think would be inexpedient at present. I hope, therefore, you will counteract any attempt to make out a call." It was with a full knowledge of these facts, and with an assurance that Mr. Gray was not expected that I consented to remain in St. Charles. And all that has been said, and written of my interfering with him; or ever intending to do so, is most unreasonable and unjust.

26. (7) The Major's history of the calling of a meeting of the congregation, and of the several meetings of the church subsequently are also against the strongest current in the testimony. The Record says. "The following petition was presented to the session, signed by fifty six names, thirty three of whom were members of the church, and twenty one regular members of the congregation." Mr. Campbell, in his testimony, gives the very names of the members desiring my settlement among them. The witnesses testify positively, that the petition was presented to the Elders, and Mr. Campbell says. "All the elders except myself refused to call a meeting in compliance with the petition." So clear is this point that the Synod, in their decision say----"It is in evidence before Synod, that a petition was presented to the session, of the church of Saint Charles. It appears to Synod, that a majority signed this petition, and therefore, that the meeting should have been called." Yet our Historian says, page 10, "though no such petition was ever presented to them, " and of the signers, he says, page 6, "only TWENTY FIVE were, it is believed, members of this church." It had been better, certainly, after the decision of Synod, if the Major had given his "impression, not his belief." He also charges Mr. Campbell, a very honest and worthy brother, who never thought of having his name enrolled on this Historic page, without specification or proof, with "resorting to certain expedients," to procure signatures to this petition.----"disingenuous and unfair." And says: "Mr. Chamberlain himself exerted an influence not strictly justifiable in the premises." Now Mr. Campbell, as in independent christian freeman circulated a petition, which met the approbation of a clear majority of the church, while, as the testimony shows, I had no agency whatever in procuring signatures; but was actually at Franklin, many miles distant, and as many of my friends know very differently employed. What flagrant personal injustice to charge me, so without evidence!!

( All ans. pages 133 to 146. )

27. The meeting petitioned for, was called by Mr. Campbell, and Mr. Emmons testifies that a large majority voted for me. To disprove this testimony of Mr. Emmons, the Major says of Mr. Campbell, page 8, "He testifies that he does not think a majority of all the members voted, though he knew there was a majority present." Now no such testimony of Mr. Campbell, in reference to THIS meeting, was ever given. It is testimony however, wrested from its proper place, and applied here to suit a purpose---to make the witness contradict Mr. Emmons. So a man's oath is not safe in the hands of this writer!

28. On the 26th April the Church resolved to call a meeting to elect one or more Ruling Elders, on the 2d Sabbath in May. So our impartial writer bestows special attention on it, and speaks of it on page 9-11 as held 25th, 26th and 27th of April--(three days in succession! ) He calls it "the little meeting." "Mr. Chamberlain and his little party," and says, page 10, "This meeting of the church consisted of LESS THAN A THIRD PART of its members." Yet in all the labored efforts of a judicial investigation, neither Major Sibley himself, not any other witness, desirous as they were to invalidate our proceedings, ever dared to assert such things. And every member present on the 26th April knows that they were untrue, and that that was not a "little meeting." Our Historian makes more broad assertions about the meeting on the 10th of May, at which the election of Elders took place, and says, page 12: "THERE WERE VERY FEW MEMBERS of the church concerned in the election---those who participated--some were not members of the church of Saint Charles." But unfortunately for the Major, the testimony is against

him again, "Quest. Was there a full meeting at the election of Elders? A. There was. Q. Was the vote unanimous? A. It was. Q. Do you know what proportion of the members were present at the election of Elders? A. A majority." A part of the testimony which refers to a previous election reads this: "Q. Were there any persons, members of other churches, who voted? A. There were not-- That rule has always been strictly attended to, in all elections we have had."

29. Our Historian say, page 19, "The new Elders were D E P O S E D by Presbytery and synod," and on the strength of this statement, he charges me, and my associates with placing ourselves "in an attitude very much like defiance toward the law of the Presbyterian church." And on page 19 he says, "this action of Mr. Chamberlain took place after the Synod had D E P O S E D his new Elders from office, and dissolved his connection with them, as a session, and was consequently an act of usurpation, and in violation of the settled law of the Presbyterian church." Here is, indeed a very high charge against one, at least, of the "sworn guardians" of our ecclesiastical body.---A charge brought and persevered in---not withstanding the shield thrown over me, by the solemn judgment of my Presbytery-- a high minded and honorable court of Christ. As the reader might well suppose, this charge has no foundation in truth. The Synod gave me their ADVICE. They said of the choice of Elders, "This act Synod judge irregular and void." And of the acts of these new Elders they said "these are irregular," they never used the important, technical word "D E P O S E D". We appealed from their decision, and our appeal secured to us, the RIGHT of continuance, until our appeal should be issued, as every constitutional lawyer well knows. To be "D E P O S E D" is a very different thing in our law. DEPOSITION would indeed set us all aside. Because THAT implies CRIME, and is never applied without such implication. The act of Synod was designated to annul the election. But the APPEAL arrested its force. Accordingly, when I asked in the assembly of '37 "If we had a RIGHT to continue?--if the Elders might still exercise their office?" I was answered "Yes." Yet the Major, in making the foregoing charge, against us all, has No party feeling whatever."---'No motive to mislead.'

(See pages 147 to 151)

30. (9) On page 19, he says: "It is very true, that several RESPECTABLE and WORTHY citizens of Saint Charles have, until recently contributed to the support of Mr. Chamberlain. Some of them are in truth, OPEN and VIOLENT ENEMIES of the Presbyterian church, and are not sorry to witness the SHAMEFUL CONFUSION that has for the last two years been kept up in this church." This is really a very strange character to give "SEVERAL RESPECTABLE AND WORTHY CITIZENS!" It is no more than simple justice to them, that I say here, I know of nothing to sustain it. It corresponds very well, however, with a charge contined in another part of the record, as made by Messrs. Lindsay, Watson and others before their Presbytery, viz. "That a party have called in unblievers, and SCOFFERS to vote down the church." Whether such language applied to our "respectable and worthy citizens" in a public manner, is most likely to increase their respect for its authors, I leave them and the public at large to judge. I, for one, shall be content, if I am so happy as to treat "respectable" citizens with RESPECTFUL LANGUAGE.

( Ans. p. 151 to 154.)

31. I now ask, is the reader satisfied with the foregoing specifications?-- That the truth of my proposition is established?--That the history is "UTTERLY UNWORTHY OF HIS CONFIDENCE?" I shall take it for granted that he is, and stay my pen from noting farther particulars. Yes, I hope he will not, for a moment suppose I have noted all the errors of the book. I assure him there are others in reserve. These are assertions of facts, which it is easy to disprove---language is ascribed to us, which we never used--principles of action, which we never embraced. He who is not more than satisfied however, with what I have already presented, would not be satisfied with anything which I could write. And there may some such. I will do them all the good in my power, and as little harm, and leave them to be convinced in a world where none doubt.

( Ans. page 155. )

32. Messrs. Lindsay and Watson certified the truth of this pamphlet, bad as it is--and sent it to the Assembly with their certificate on a blank leaf. Though the records are kept back, to our injury, the certified book was there in good time. They do, indeed, except a little to the 1st chapter, for Watson knew he was not an Elder, as these stated, tho' he had not the frankness to admit it. And also to the 3rd, for Mr. Lindsay knew he had no such character as that romancing chapter labors to give him. But they affirm the truth of all the balance, and thus involve themselves before the assembly and before the world in the errors which are herein set forth. They do it deliberately, and with settled purpose, because they do it to affect the judicial decision of one of our largest-ecclesiastical courts in the land. Some of our older citizens may be a little curious and WONDER, as I do, WHAT THERE IS, IN THE CHARACTER, the HEAD, the HEART or the BLOOD of S. L. Watson, that entitles him to certify to the prejudice of any man! I respect judicial decisions---but let them be based on evidence, and not on such histories as this. I honor gray hairs. But let them blossom on the truth, and be borne aloft, and shaken above such masses of error.

( See page 155 )

33. The reader cannot fail to have observed, that there are some great principles, interesting to all, at issue, between me and my friends. The author and party to which he belongs-- I say distinctly, THE PARTY to which HE belongs. For his covering has been stripped off, and his position shown before all. The Major stands, with military precision, in the front rank, in full uniform, and with all the fresh laurels of his historic pen, clustering about him.

( See page 155 )

34. WE, on the one part, contend for the right of appearing and being heard with evidence. THEY, on the other, would have us tried and condemned without it. We hold the right of appeal as sacred and all the benefits it secures to an injured party. They would thrust us from these benefits, and bind us up to obey the decision of the inferior court, whatever it may be. We maintain inviolate, the right of majorities to govern, and of the people to be ruled by the representatives of their choice. They would have the minority govern, and their "sworn guardians" rule the people for years, without redress of grievance. We think justice ought to take a straight course, and that all attempt to forstall judgment, are morally wrong, and productive of mischief only. ---

( See page 155 )

They would argue their cause beforehand, with the court by means of partisan prints, covertly sent, and certified by themselves. We aver that when a man has been published, slandered, tried, and finally acquitted by such men as composed the Missouri Presbytery, he should be let alone. They agree, that the witnesses against him, having failed of their object, shall further prosecute him with a book.

35. Really they do show, in an impressive manner, the truth of one sentiment, that stands recorded on the last page of the aforesaid history, viz: "There exists AN INHERENT, MUTUALLY REPULSIVE INFLUENCE, SO POSITIVELY IMMOVEABLE AND INSURMOUNTABLE, that were Mr. C. believed by all to be as pure as Caesar's wife, and to possess the learning and talents of St. Paul, it would prevent the union."---Such feelings on the part of professing christians, so different from the teachings of the divine Savior, printed and published to be read by perishing men I sorely lament, and have mourned over them for months. I have not, indeed, at all, doubted their deep-rooted and bitter influence. They fully account to my mind for the movements of the party--for the acts of Presbytery of Saint Charles,--for my arraignment and trial,--for the disposition to preserve after an ignoble defeat---in efforts to hunt me down by means of a printed book. No man can account for such facts without admitting the influence of such feelings. And here we are relieved from all conjecture, by a naked avowal of their existence.

( Ans. pages 155 to 157. )

36. Certainly, it affords matter for melancholy reflection, that the bosom, where such fires are pent up, must be strangely agitated--- must heave and swell at times, as the volcano, and cannot afford much joy, to its possessor. I pray, therefore, that the grace of God may extinguish those devouring elements wherever they may exist, and give to the READER, to ME, and to ALL, the holy oil of PEACE, --- pure, lasting, heavenly minded peace!

H. CHAMBERLAIN.

37. N. B. The foregoing facts of record are commended to the serious consideration of certain, whose names are not before the public, but who are clearly seen in the distance.

(Note: Numbers as given on side of page, left hand margin--are page numbers as noted and referred to in book.)

47. NOTE: Since the publication of "The Recent History", I have detected several errors of the press. On page 1, para. 2, Mr. Robinson's decease is printed 1835 instead of 1828.--Page 2 and in other places, the names of Rev. Warren Nichols is mis-spelled Nicholas.--Page 9, par. 4 is a misprint of the date in two places (evidently a misprint)--the Sabbath that actually occurred on the 26th of April, is printed 25th in one place and 27th in another.-- Page 16, par 5, inverted commas occur at the end of the 23rd line. This is an error of the printer. In the original Mss. as may be seen, the quotation marks are confined to the words "an Oppressive yoke." In fact, there is no other part of the sentence included in commas, as a quotation; and those at the end of the 23rd line, are manifestly placed there by mistake of the printer.----None of these, however, are worthy of notice, as they do not in the least affect any material statement in the narrative. Nor is there an error throughout the publication, that the intelligent reader may not readily correct as typographical mistakes evidently, except the 5th par., page 2, where Mr. Watson is stated to have been an elder acting with Mr. Lindsay, <sup>this is my mistake--it was corrected by Mr. Watson, but too late to prevent its being printed--but even this error was of no importance, as regards the History of subsequent events; and of very little in reference to</sup> 48 the "affair of Mr. Wood." But as Mr. Chamberlain complained of those errors in his later publication, and labors hard to make out from them an influence unfavorable to the substantial truth of my narrative, I have thought fit to explain them here. At most they are trifling, and certainly do not merit the captious notice that the Rev. Gentleman has ( probably for lack of other argument ) so earnestly bestowed on them.

With these corrections, and the expressed approbation of the two Elders Lindsay and Watson, as to its substantial truth, I now submit my "Narrative", (page 1 to 24) to the candid reader, in the reasonable expectation that each one will appreciate it and the writers object, with an impartial and an unbiassed judgment.-----

Mr. Chamberlain's criticism, or , as he calls it "Major Sibley's Church History, Cross-Examined"; may or may not claim my particular notice hereafter. If on further consideration of the matter, it shall appear in any way obligatory to me to notice it at all; it shall assuredly be done in a very through manner; but I shall, in so doing, consult my own business and conveniences. For if done at all, it will be done more with the view of vindicating before our church, than before the public, the truth of my narrative, as avouched by our two respected Elders, Lindsay and Watson.

GEORGE SIBLEY.

August 29th, 1847.



## R E V I E W

OF REV. H. CHAMBERLAIN'S REPLY TO

G. C. Sibley's RECENT HISTORY.

Commenced 1st November 1837, and

Completed 1st June, 1838.

In Six Letters addressed direct

To Rev. H. Chamberlain.

From page 49 to page 158 inclusive.

Letter 1st	-	1st November '37-	- - -	page 49
" 2nd	-	24th January '38	- - - -	" 57 to 63
" 3rd	-	3rd February '38	- - - -	" 64 to 83
" 4th	-	17th February '38-	- - - -	" 84 to 102
" 5th	⊕	4th May '38	- - - - -	"103 to 146
" 6th	-	28th May '38-	- - - - -	"147 to 158

R E V I E W

On more mature reflection, and the advice of some friends, I conclude to re-examine carefully, the "Records" and other Documents upon which my narrative of April last was principally founded, with the view of detecting and correcting any error of fact into which I may have fallen. And I also for the same reasons, determine to REVIEW Mr. Chamberlain's publication of July last, but very fully and very freely too.-- All this labour I shall submit to, for the purpose solely of vindicating the truth, as relates to our Church History since the 1st January, 1835, as well as my own agency in attempting fairly to record it.

But I shall use my own convenience, and perfect liesure in the performance of this task.

G. C. SIBLEY.

Linden Wood October 1837.

48 8/10

Index to the following review, pages 49 to 158--

In reference to the printed pages 37 to 46.

For Notices of the two first pages---See pages 73 to 82

Paragraph 6th--a misstatement and misconception-- p. 84 to 86

" 7th & 8th answered. p. 86-91-

" 10 & 11. answered. p. 92-to 97.

Proof " the first answered fully, page 92 to 97.

" " " Second, as to Col'd members &c., 99 to 101

" " " Third answered p. 102

" " " FOURTH Answered p. 103 to 128

" " " Fifth answered p. 128 to 130

" " " Sixth answered p. 131 to 133

" " " Seventh answered p. 133 to 146.

" " " Eighth answered p. 146 to 151

" " " Ninth answered p. 151 to 154.

Enquiry as to an assertion in his paragraph 29-p. 50

Reply to the enquiry thro' Mr. Emmons--p. 57.

The point fully argued. . . pages 52 to 63.

"Cause " and the "Occasion"--how they differ--p. 105 to 107

His illustration in the 20th Paragraph noticed p. 107, 108.

His dealing in inuendos and insinuations noticed, p. 86-87.

His complain that his pamphlet of May 1836 has not been answered-37.

--that complain noticed fully 121 to 128

48 9/10

The "Bed Quilt" story noticed p. 91-96.

Eliab Wenkin's opinion of his conduct p. 115-116

Rev. F. R. Gray's testimony p. 122-124 before Missouri Presbytery

Same--his opinion of Mr. C., his letter, 207.

G. C. Sibley's testimony before Commission &c., 94 to 97.

As to his Election and Majorities, p. 130-140 to 144.

Dr. B. Graham's testimony-St. Charles Presbyery, 112

Same " Before Synod, 134

Alex. B. Campbell's Do. on diff't occasion--113-134

B. R. Wardlaw's Do. before the commission 115.

Some further notices--pages 154 to 158.

49 Rev. Hiram Chamberlain.

Sir:-- A copy of the little pamphlet that you published in July last, entitled "Major Sibley's Church History cross-examined, and put to the test of Record", was duly served on me, thro' the post office early in August; but it passed out of my hands before I had an opportunity to examine its contents. It is true, I did HEAR it read within a few hours after I received the copy you furnished me with, but the remark of a friend, that it did not merit or require any notice from me, prevented my bestowing upon the reading, even so much attention as would enable me to comprehend any more of the production than its general temper and style and not particularly admiring it in those respects, I readily yielded to my friend's suggestion and at once concluded ( too hastily perhaps ) to drop the subject, and leave its further agitation to those who have more taste and more leisure for such things than I have.---But having very recently come across another copy of your pamphlet, which I have examined somewhat attentively, I find that I have been much mistaken as to its real merits; and now confess my regret that I have so long neglected to look into, and pay it my respects.

50

I offer you this explanation by way of apology for my negligence, and use the occasion to say, that as soon as I can find leisure, I mean to take another look into the facts and records, with the view of correcting any errors that have been circulated either in yours or my pamphlet; and you may expect that whatever I find untrue in either, will be duly noted and laid before you again.--

There is one point of no small importance that I request an explanation of, as soon as convenient--On the 8th page of your pamphlet, speaking of the new elders, you say "Accordingly, when I asked in the assembly of 1837, if we had a right to continue," If the Elders might still exercise their office." I was answered "Yes". Do you mean to be understood, sir, as asserting that the assembly as a Body, did thus decide? Or merely that such was the answer of some individual member or members of that Body?

51

I am at a loss to know what construction to put on the sentence, but presume the latter, and unless corrected shall so consider the matter in what I may find it proper to say, upon THAT subject.

Yr.mo. Obt. Svt.

G. C. Sibley

Linden Wood November 1st, 1837.

---

Rev. Sir:--I have to acknowledge the rect. of a note from your friend, Mr. Emmons, intended, I presume, as answer to the latter part of mine to you of the 1st Nov. The following is an exact copy.

St. Charles, 8th Nov. 1837.

Dr. Sir:--The meaning of the following sentence has been requested of Mr. Chamberlain--"Accordingly when I asked in the Assembly of '37 "if we had a right to continue" "if the Elders might still exercise their office?" I was answered "Yes".-- It means as to the fact, that Mr. Chamberlain addressing himself to the Moderator, while standing in his proper place, he asked these questions, and from him, and several voices in different parts of the House, he understood that answer "Yes" and "Yes" certainly was the only exclusive reply. So far as his hearing served him, and he is persuaded there is no other..... I am authorised by Mr. Chamberlain to make this explanation to any who may desire it. I am yours,

Benj. Emmons.

Maj. G. C. Sibley.

52 Before I enter upon the re-examination of the "Church History", or notice your gentle strictures thereon; it may be well to dispose of this INCIDENTAL topick, touching the rights OFFICIAL of those individuals, whose appointment as ruling Elders in the Church of St. Charles, was declared "IRREGULAR AND VOID," and set aside in October 1835, by the solemn judgment of the Synod of Missouri; which judgment you and they have appealed from, to the General Assembly; and which you broadly assert, is suspended, and its whole force, binding authority and operation, arrested by virtue of your appeal. And that until the General Assembly confirm it, those individuals may lawfully CONTINUE to exercise all the functions, offices and duties of ruling Elders, in and over the Church of St. Charles.----- This is the position you have taken and on many occasions have you suited your action to the position, as far as your influence in this church stands; and if I have not mistaken the meaning of the explanation given by your coadjutor and worthy substitute Mr. Emmons, in his note just quoted; you NOW 53 claim to have obtained the sanction of the General Assembly as to the correctness of your position. Whether YOUR view be correct or not on this point, I shall not now enquire: But I beg leave to deny that the General Assembly has authorized you to quote any act or decision of theirs in support of your position. I have now before me a letter from the Rev. John Mc Dowall, the Stated Clerk of the Assembly, in answer to some enquiries on this very subject, from which I quote the following, for your information:

"As to the question said to be asked in the Assembly, viz: "If the ELDERS MIGHT EXERCISE THEIR OFFICE, 2 and the affirmative answer said to be given, there "is no notice of these on the minutes; and therefore I conclude, that whatever "an individual or individuals may have said, there was no action of the Assembly, "and no opinion expressed as the opinion of the Assembly."

Whilst Mr. Mc Dowall's letter is before me I will quote from it also, a certified transcript from the records of the minutes of the last Assembly.

"Tuesday morning, May 30th, the Assembly took up the appeal and complain "of the Church of St. Charles against the Synod of Missouri laid over by the "last Assembly. The Church appeared and was ready for trial, but the records of "the Synod not being present, the appeal was postponed, and it was ordered that "the Synod of Missouri send in their Records to the next General Assembly." \*\*\*\*\*

There is evidently a material discrepancy between Mr. Mc Dowall's statement and YOURS, in relation to this matter. In this instance, at least, you have "TRAVELLED OUT OF THE RECORD;" as the lawyers say. Whatever may have been the real character of the proceedings in the Assembly of '37," to which you refer, it is quite certain that it was not conducted in the usual business order, or intended to be considered or used, as a DECISION, of that body. I am fully warranted in saying this, not only by Mr. Mc Dowall's statement, but because it is inconceivably so that the Assembly should have committed so great an impropriety, as to express ANY opinion affecting the merits, knowing as they did that the records of the Synod were not present.

How could the Assembly know, except from those records, anything about the situations of the supposed elders?---whether they had been disowned as

---

\*\*\*\*\* If you wish it you may see Mr. Mc Dowall's letter above referred to, by applying to your friend Mr. Emmons, with whom it will be placed for your inspection.

55 appointed without authority; or suspended, or deposed by the Synod? It is evident from the proceeding in the case, as given in the transcript furnished by Dr. Mc Dowell, already quoted, that the Assembly was even ignorant of its true character.

YOU might have been surprised, Sir, (I marvel that you did not correct the error ), to find YOUR appeal docketed on the Assembly's records as "THE APPEAL AND COMPLAINT of THE CHURCH OF ST. CHARLES AGAINST THE SYNOD OF MISSOURI." The record of the Synod will of course rectify this mistake, and make it manifest to the Assembly, that the judgment from which you and your would-be Elders have appealed, is precisely such as "THE CHURCH OF ST. CHARLES" desired; and which they confidently hope and expect, will be fully confirmed.

56 The supposition that you really do consider the proceeding "IN THE ASSEMBLY OF '37," as explained by Mr. Emmons, to have been anything like a regular act of that body, argued a degree of ignorance on your part, of the established forms of legislation, that is wholly inconsistent with your known experience therein. For it appears from your own showing, that YOU and not the proper presiding officer, who was present, put the question, if it WAS put at all, and that you were content with the affirmative answer from "SEVERAL VOICES IN DIFFERENT PARTS OF THE HOUSE." You called for and obtained the AYES, but omitted to demand the noes; an omission that leave great room for doubt, whether the "several voices" expressed the opinion of the Assembly.--- All doubt must vanish forever when we recur to the fact, that the Assembly had not just been informed that the Records of the Synod had not been sent up--consequently, even those who "answered yes" to your questions, must have done so HYPOTHETICALLY, upon such ex-parte representations of your case as may have been made to them in private conversations--for you will not pretend that you addressed the ASSEMBLY in explanation, on the occasion referred to.-- It ought not to be supposed for a moment, that any member or members of that body COULD have answered your questions, under such circumstances, OTHERWISE THAN HYPOTHETICALLY.--

57 From the foregoing premises which you cannot but admit are fairly answered and correctly stated, the following conclusions do necessarily follow closely.

FIRST: When you "asked in the assembly," the questions that you SAY you asked, your wish and aim must have been to obtain for yourself "THE RIGHT TO CONTINUE", in YOUR assumed office, and permission that "the (Disowned) Elders might STILL exercise THEIR office."--

SECOND: Consequently, you must have entertained some serious doubts and misgivings as to the propriety and LEGALITY of STILL CONTINUING to exercise those offices ( to say nothing of the past ) under the existing circumstances, WITHOUT such sanction or permission.

THIRD: That you and your coadjutors, ( the disowned elders) HAD officiated in those very offices, PREVIOUSLY to your application for permission and SINCE the judgment of the Synod, from which you appealed.

FOURTH: That "the Assembly" of '37" DID NOT GRANT YOU the "right to continue", nor permission that "the (disowned) Elders" might still exercise their office"-- and that they could not have done so, without manifesting partiality and injustice, " the record of the Synod not being present."

58 FIFTH: That no individual member or members of the Assembly could have intended to reply OFFICIALLY to your questions, or to give any other than Hypothetic answers, founded entirely on INFORMAL EX PARTE evidence.--

SIXTH: That your pretension of official right in yourself and coadjutors, to act during the pendency of your appeal, so confidently set up and proclaimed from pulpit and press, and your more than insinuation that the "Assembly of '37" did authorise you so to act; is a pretension that you do not yourself fully accredit ( else you would not have asked those questions,) and so far as it goes to implicate the General Assembly, is absolutely false, and manifestly mischievous.

58 con I am aware Sir, that it may possibly suit your policy to turn upon me here, with the assertion, that I have misunderstood your REAL, INTENDED meaning in what you have spoken and published, and authorised Mr. Ben: Emmons to explain, touching those questions, &c.--- Should you so determine, should you so desire to try the OTHER Horn of the dilemma. and wish to be understood to mean that those  
59 "several voices" that you UNDERSTOOD to say "Yes" to your questions, expressed nothing more than unofficial, individual impressions; if you think proper to claim this position, and will unequivocally notify me of it, I will with great pleasure, withdraw all that I have said, in error, on the presumption that you had chosen the OTHER horn.

It was in this attitude that I proposed in my first note, to consider you; not because I so understood the language used in your pamphlet ( for it does not convey that meaning to MY mind, or to that of any other person that I know of ) but because, having Dr. Mc Dowell's letter before me, I knew that such OUGHT to have been YOUR meaning. But your explanations thro' Mr. Emmons compels me to understand you differently; and unless you think fit to explain away the explanation of your very worthy compeer, I must abide by my present understanding of its intended meaning.--- Whatever may have been YOUR meaning or your motive, you have certainly so expressed yourself from the pulpit and the press, as to be very generally understood to assert that you did obtain on the occasion you refer to, a  
60 decision "in the Assembly" and BY the Assembly; granting authoritatively, the right and permission for yourself and the disowned Elders, to continue to exercise the offices you have assumed, of Minister and ruling Elders, in and over the Church of St. Charles.----This delusion still continues with your full knowledge, consent and connivances; for wherever your pamphlet circulates, and is read, it does certainly produce in most minds the erroneous impression that I have here indicated; to the manifest hurt of this church, and in derogation of the legitimate authority of its regularly appointed and duly recognized officers.--

If you really had no intention to claim any authority or sanction from the General Assembly for yours and the disputed Elders continued exercise of the offices assumed, why use the words "In the Assembly?" Or why mention at all in your pamphlet the questions that you SAY you asked in that body? You surely could not imagine that the mere private opinions of "several" individuals, altho' members, could confer, or be supposed to confer any such authority, or OUGHT to have the least influence under the existing circumstances., upon the RIGHTS  
61 of either of the parties in the case. and if you had thought proper to inform your hearers and readers, in plain terms, without connecting "THE ASSEMBLY" in the transaction, that you had obtained the private opinion of several members of that body favorable to your own views; the effect would have been entirely harmless; it would have occurred at once to every candid, intelligent mind, that as the records of the Synod were absent, those "Several" members must certainly have either QUALIFIED their opinions, or acted very indiscreetly.--

The disowning and setting aside, as unlawfully appointed, the individuals claiming to be the new elders, and the refusal to recognize or allow your assumed relationship to this church, by the Synod of Missouri, are the prime subjects of complaint in your appeal; all this WE know. But as the record of the Synod. touching this case, were never before the General Assembly, or accessible to its members, THEY could know nothing of the matter to justify any official or responsible action or opinion.--- Suppose, for illustration, that the Presbytery and Synod had concurred in disowning your new Elders, so called, because  
62 of some well proven and fully specified, corrupt and wicked practises in their election ( and how could the Assembly or any of its members know to the contrary or what might have been the facts of the case except from the records?) --would it be proper think you, even for the Assembly, much less for "SEVERAL VOICES", to consent that those disowned Elders should be permitted to exercise office and



62 authority , for a year longer, at least, in and over The Church of St. Charles? --- If you and your co-adjutors determine to continue in the exercise of your assumed duties; do so entirely on your own responsibility; but beware how you attempt to involve either the General Assembly, or the "Several Voices" that answered "Yes," to your questions , in the palpable impropriety of sanctioning such a course.

YOU have sufficiently proved, that YOU believe some other sanction than your own opinion necessary; and I think I have very clearly proven that you failed to obtain that of the Assembly.

63 But I need not further trouble you on this point: What has been said is enough to convince you that you ought without delay to correcte the mischievous error that you have circulated throughout the Church and community, ----If it be indeed a delusion produced by a misunderstanding of your INTENDED meaning, you will of course, hasten to remove it in the manner more effectual, and which your own judgment and perfect understanding of the whole subject, will most readily point out.

Sickness and unavoidable causes of interruption, have delayed this communication much longer than I wished, or intended: but this is of little consequence I presume. I have not yet been able to complete a satisfactory re-examination of the documents, &c., on which are founded principally, the little Church History of which you have so bitterly complained; and am not of course, prepared to answer, as conclusively as I wish, the objections that you have set forth so KINDLY and with such GENTLEMANLY COURTESY, in your late pamphlet; it will not be long, however, I hope, before you hear from me on THAT subject.

Your Mo. Obt. Svt.

G. C. Sibley.

Linde Wood,  
January 24th, 1838

-----

64 Rev. Sir:-- I copy the following from the St. Charles Clarion of 29th April, 1837. "Mr. Patten, an anonymous pamphlet just printed at your office, has been put into " my hands; it purports to be a faithful narrative of facts, but seems calculated " to mislead the minds of some in relation to important particulars; which may be "made to appear from the RECORD ITSELF--The NAME of the real, reponsible Author " is therefore respectfully called for- - - -H. Chamberlain."

\*\*\*\* \* \* \* \* \*

The same No. of the Clarion contained the following reply:

"Mr. Patten is hereby authorised to answer Rev. Mr. Chamberlain's request, by "informing him that I am the real, and responsible Author of the pamphlet he "alludes to, and that I shall be ever ready to acknowledge and to correct any "errors therein contained, when made sensible of them, inasmuch as it is my "sole aim and desire to establish and set forth the simple truth, in regard to "the matters discussed in said pamphlet." Friday morning, 28th April, 1837."

"G. C. Sibley"

65 I have taken the trouble to transcribe the above because in your pamphlet of July last, 2nd page, you plainly intimate that you FIRST met with my "anonymous pamphlet" on the Ohio when on your way to Philadelphia in May '37.-- Many of

65 your readers so understand your meaning; and such is the obvious plain construction of the language you have employed-- About ten days had elapsed after the publication of my narrative, before you left St. Charles for Philadelphia; and I was careful to send you, thro' the post office, the VERY FIRST copy that I authorised to be published or circulated; and this you acknowledged ( in the Clarion of 29th April ) to have received in St. Charles.----Your having allowed yourself to use an INSINUATION that imputes to me the design of concealing from you my publication in order to affect unfairly your case before the General Assembly, obliges me ( in passing ) thus to remind you of the facts as they actually occurred; and justifies me in calling upon you EVEN NOW, to correct THIS ERROR ALSO, into which you have led your readers.

66 I now proceed to present for your candid consideration, a few remarks on the contents of your late publication; the professed object of which is, to CROSS EXAMINE my "Church History" and to try its veracity by the test of "The Record"--- Here I must remind you, Sir, that I have not pretended to found my narrative EXCLUSIVELY or RECORDED testimony; if I had, I must necessarily have failed to furnish anything like a full and correct history; for we all know, that there are many very material facts connected with the "Recent History" and disturbance of this church, not to be found on record, or in the archives of any of our Indicatives; and it is also true, that no testimony is entitled to credit MERELY because it is recorded.

67 In the performance of the duty I had undertaken of presenting to those interested ( NOT TO THE PUBLIC AT LARGE ) a brief account of the recent events in the Presbyterian Church of St. Charles. I was obliged to search for and collect the facts where I could find them; taking care to use none, but such as I knew, or had good reason to believe, were authentick.--I was aware of my liability to err in this, as well in my judgment as in the process of collation; and more than once expressed my fears to several friends, that not withstanding all my care to avoid it, I might fall into some errors of fact. And when you Sir, announced ( in the Clarion of 29th April ) the existence of errors in my narrative in some "IMPORTANT PARTICULARS", did I not promptly, without the delay of an hour, write you to point them out to me for immediate correction?-- Perhaps the cause of truth might have been quite as well served, had you THUS sought to remedy for any supposed misstatements of mine, as it HAS been by the publication and circulation of SUCH a pamphlet as your last. But this course, by which every correction could easily have been made before your departure for Philadelphia would have deprived you of an opportunity to gratify your unfortunate PUGNACIOUS propensity.--

68 YOUR neglect to point out to me the errors alluded to in your notice in the Clarion, induced me, the more confiderntly, to rely on the opinion of others, who had read my narrative, and who had assured me "that it is substantially correct." Mr. Thomas Lindsay, Sen., and Mr. Samuel S. Watson, Elders of our Church of long standing; by my particular request, examined the pamphlet carefully, with a view to the detection and correction of any errors therein. The following is the result of THEIR scrutiny, which they thought proper to append to several copies of the narrative, of which they transmitted one to the Moderator, and another to the Stated Clerk of the General Assembly of '37.--" The undersigned has carefully persued the following narrative, included under seven heads, or chapters, entitled "THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH OF ST. CHARLES, MISSOURI. ITS RECENT HISTORY, STRIFE AND DISTURBANCE". Through a personal knowledge of many of the facts, and also through testimony elicited in the case, I do believe said narrative to be substantially true, forming a concise and correct narrative of the multifarious troubles which have assailed our church. Since the first of January 1835.-- Some items in the first chapter being taken from memory after a lapse, some of them, of §

68 years, are believed not to be entirely correct in some particulars.

S. S. WATSON, ELDER."

"I fully concur with my Brother in the narrative, excepting the 3rd Chapter, to which I have serious objections.

THOMAS LINDSAY, ELDER"

St. Charles, April 26th, 1837.

69 The errors referred to by Mr. Watson are, The date of the death of Rev. Mr. Robinson ( which I corrected in the margin of EVERY copy, being a misprint.) and in the 5th paragraph, 5th line, Mr. Watson is erroneously states to have been an Elder with Mr. Lindsay in Mr. Woods time. Young Mr. Cayce ( a son of the worthy old gentleman mentioned in the narrative ) was in fact the Elder at that time, and was warmly in favor of retaining Mr. Wood for another year, but was opposed by Mr. Lindsay, the Sen. Elder, ( there were but two elders at that time ) and 15 other members. Neither of these mistakes, is of the least importance as regards the SUBSEQUENT "recent" strife and disturbance, which commenced after YOUR arrival at St. Charles, in January 1835. Nor does it very MATERIALLY affect the case of Mr. Wood, whether Mr. Watson or Mr. Cayce was the Elder at the time alluded to. The Session it appears, was EQUALLY divided, the door was still closed, and Mr. Wood's withdrawal was still proper and praiseworthy; and I have yet to learn the fact, if there is in all the land, a Minister of the Presbyterian Church, YOURSELF EXCEPTED, who could be prevailed on to obtrude himself into a church, where there was even an equal division of the Session against him; to say nothing of a large proportion of other members--  
 -- -- -- -- Having corrected the mistake to which Mr. Watson refers, and which you have paraded unnecessarily in the 5th page of your pamphlet, as weighty  
 70 evidence of my want of veracity, I might here rest the case and claim for my narrative a degree of correctness that fairly entitles it to be received by all its readers as "Substantially true," This I may justly assume, upon the testimony of Messrs. Lindsay and Watson, two witnesses well known competency and creditibility. And let me add, that after a careful review of the whole subject, I feel perfectly free TO REPEAT, that my narrative DOES "PRESENT THE READER, A TRUE AND FAITHFUL VIEW OF FACTS IN THEIR NATURAL ORDER AND CONNECTION." And by the way, Sir, I may fairly conclude that you found yourself mistaken where you say, in the Clarion, that my pamphlet "seems calculated to mislead the minds of some, in relation to important particulars," as you admit it at the very outset of your cross examination, that it "HAS REALLY DONE NOBODY ANY HARM WITH US," that you can ascertain-- Thus I have the testimony of the two ruling  
 71 ELDERS of our church, that my narrative is "Substantially true" and your own that it "really has done nobody any harm with us." And yet in the very next page, you utter the broad and unqualified assertion " That THE BOOK considered as a History of our affairs is utterly unworthy the confidence of any man, or body of men,--it cannot be true." -- And then you parade your "PROOFS" as you call them, to sustain this last proposition; which I intend in due time to "CROSS EXAMINE AND PUT TO THE TEST OF RECORD." If "The Book" as you are pleased to call it, must of necessity be FALSE; and if false, is "Calculated to mislead some minds," and consequently to do harm, it cannot be false and harmless too, even "with us", if you really supposed it could you might with singular propriety, have spared yourself the labour of writing, and the PUBLICK the useless infliction of your last production, in this connection.

You open your attack upon "Major Sibley's Church History" with a most dolorous complaint to THE PUBLICK, that your CHARACTER has been assailed by me; and tho' you tell the PUBLICK that you are entirely unhurt, and that even your peace is undisturbed, nay that the History has hurt NO ONE, yet you make quite a strenuous effort, not only to enlist the publick sympathy in your own behalf, but at the same time to excite against me its indignation. Whilst you propose only to controversy certain statements in my

72 narrative and disclaim any cause of private, personal dispute with me, you exhibit yourself throughout your publication, with such **MALIGNANT** personality, in a manner and form so offensive to the established laws of courtesy and gentlemanly intercourse, that it is with extreme repugnance I continue to notice you or your pamphlet any farther. After I shall have vindicated my church history from your "Cross examination", and presented you a fair opportunity and motive to correct the errors of fact and argument that I am fully prepared to prove do abound in your late pamphlet, I trust it may never again fall to my lot to be brought into collision with you in any manner whatever.--

73 As to your character, Sir, I know nothing of it, pro or con.; whatever it may be, I have never assailed, or wished to assail it. In my narrative, it became my duty to speak of your **CONDUCT AS A PUBLIC MAN**, in connection with the recent history of this church; and I am quite sure that YOU can have no just cause to complain of the manner in which I have discharged that duty. I would have had not motive for using your name at all, except in reference to the events I was recording; in which relation I recognized you **ONLY** as a functionary of the Presbyterian Church. It is true that I have imputed to you ( mainly ) the unhappy disturbance of the peace of this church, and expressed my own decided disapprobation of your course and conduct-- In this I believe I was justified by the **PROVED FACTS ADDUCED**; and still believe so. Other will of course draw their own conclusions, from their own view of the facts.--

74 On the first two pages of your pamphlet I observe some assertions, insinuations and innuendos, which, tho' not strictly relevant to the subject in hand, demand some notice.--- In order to assist your readers in coming at the truth, and the better to understand the nature of your controversy, and properly to appreciate your "incontrovertible proofs," you inform them that in the summer of 1835 while you were "**BUSILY EMPLOYED IN VISITING THE SICK, DURING THE CHOLERA**"; certain individuals went up to the Presbytery of St. Charles then in Session near Palmyra, and made such representations to them of our character and conduct, as led to the passage of a set of resolutions, which were deemed highly injurious and oppressive in their bearing on this Church: the more so as the meeting was held without our knowledge. The case went up by appeal to the Synod, and thence to the Assembly of 1836."--

75 As your pamphlet was written professedly for the special use of **STRANGERS**, to prevent their being misled by "misrepresentation employed to subvert plain matters of fact," **DESIGNED** to injure you; I may be permitted to suggest to you wherein you have yourself misled that class of your readers, in the paragraph above quoted, by the use of the very means you condemn.-- In order to convince you of the truth of what I say, I must give you what every **STRANGER** at least, will doubtless consider the correct reading and true interpretation of this paragraph. Thus:-- **IN THE SUMMER OF 1835, YOU BEING THEN THE PASTOR OR MINISTER OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH OF ST. CHARLES, AND THE CHOLERA THEN AND THERE BEING PREVALENT; CERTAIN FACTIOUS INDIVIDUALS, TAKING ADVANTAGE UNDULY OF THE DISTRESSING CIRCUMSTANCES THAT NECESSARILY CONFINED, AND BUSILY EMPLOYED YOU AT HOME, IN VISITING AND MINISTERING SPIRITUALLY TO THE SICK AND DYING, SECRETLY WENT UP TO THE PRESBYTERY; AND BY THE EXHIBITION OF FALSE CHARGES AGAINST THE CHARACTER AND CONDUCT OF YOURSELF AND CHURCH OF ST. CHARLES, PROCURED THE PASSAGE OF RESOLUTIONS WHICH ARE DEEMED HIGHLY INJURIOUS AND OPPRESSIVE TO SAID CHURCH; PARTICULARLY SO, AS THE PROCEEDINGS WAS MANAGED AND CONDUCTED SO PRIVATELY, THAT NEITHER YOU OR THE CHURCH HAD ANY KNOWLEDGE EVEN, OF THE INTENDED MEETING OF THE PRESBYTERY, &c.**-----

It is well and extensively known, that St. Charles was dreadfully scourged by the Cholera some few summers ago, when nearly one tenth of its population was swept off in a few weeks.

75 Strangers however, as you are aware, are not apt, generally, to recollect dates with precision in reference to such events; tho' the events themselves may be well remembered.-- I apprehend, Sir, that the most of your DISTANT readers will naturally understand you to have allusion, in the paragraph quoted, to that awful visitation to which I have reference; and FROM that allusion it is evidently a principal object of the paragraph to impress on the minds of your readers that it occurred in the summer of 1835, ESPECIALLY STANGERS, THAT IT WAS WHILST YOU WERE "BUSILY OFFICIATING IN THE MIDST IF THE DREADFUL PESTILENCE, a most wicked persecution was commenced against YOU and the church of St. Charles, then under your charge.

76 If this be not your INTENDED allusion, U confess myself unable to perceive what else it CAN be, consistently with any known fact; for certainly there was NO PREVALENCE of Cholera here in the summer of 1835.

Now Sir, unless I have misconstrued, this very INGENIOUSLY framed passage ( first page ) which you will hardly venture to suggest, a mere glance at the "PLAIN MATTERS OF FACT" involved, will convince you I am sure, that you have ~~done~~ how or other, fallen into the very error that I have hinted, and that you so properly deprecate.--

77 Pray let us look into the matter at once.-- If EVER you were connected with the Church of St. Charles officials, in any way, I am not aware of it. I DO know POSITIVELY, that no such relationship has existed within the last ten years.-- the RECORDS furnish abundant evidence to the contrary.-- they prove, that altho' you have SOUGHT this connection ( of Pastor or Minister ) for more than three years, with most extraordinary pertinacity, you have been steadily rejected by the Session with a majority of the church, and by the Presbytery and the Synod has also refused to recognize you in this relation. So much for THIS "plain matter of fact." Next as the "prevalance of Cholera" &c. You were not HERE, Sir, AT ALL, during the time of that awful visitation; which was in the summer of 1833, nearly two years before you came to St. Charles to reside. In 1835, there were but very few cases of Cholera, and but little sickness of ANY kind, in St. Charles, or its vicinity, up to the time you mention, when those "certain individuals went up to the Presbytery," the very fact of THEIR going ( two of them having large families at the time ) is good evidence that there existed no general alarm, or cause for any. In point of fact, there WAS NO such alarm. Dr. Graham in a note to me states that for four of five weeks preceeding the 1st of June 1835 St. Charles and vicinity were "REMARKABLY healthy;" this you will observe, embraces the very time, that you were so busily employed in visiting the sick, during the prevalence of cholera," for you know that "the Presbytery, then in session near Palmyra" to which those "certain individuals went up," commenced its session on the 5th of June, so that those individuals must have left home about the 1st or 2nd of June, as was indeed the fact.-- Your insinuation that they took advantage of your busy employment among the sick, the cholera prevailing, is all a fiction.

78 But the most remarkable fact touching this remarkable paragraph, is, that altho' there WERE ACTUALLY FIVE CASES, ( and ONLY five ) of dangerous illness in St. Charles or vicinity at or near the time you mention, of which three were SUPPOSED to be cholera, and all of them terminated in death, and were in your immediate neighbourhood; yet YOU were only "busily employed in visiting " ONE of them; neglecting ALL the other, though two of the sufferers were professing Christians: and what is more remarkable is the fact, that the four died, before the ONE you DID visit, was taken ill. And I cannot omit also to notice another remarkable fact in this connection; the SINGLE case that you DID visit, did not occur untill AFTER those "certain individuals" had returned from the Presbytery, and had been at home several days. Why, Sir, do you not remember that the record of your Session says "On Sabbath June 14th, immediately after the morning service, Mr. Chamberlain presented to the CONGREGATION OF ST. CHARLES, the Act of the Presbytery of St. Charles of June 6th, RECEIVED BY HIM JUNE 14TH, the Session "presented to the CONGREGATION and appeal from said Act for THEIR consideration." &c.

79 Now Sir, when you call to mind this OTHER little fact touching this matter, namely, that the excellent and much lamented Lady to whose case I have alluded, as the ONLY one that you visited, &c., was not taken sick till the 15th or 16th of June, that after that she was convalescent and rode out, but relapsed, and died on the 23rd of June; ( so I am informed by Dr. Graham ) I am sure you will be convinced that your busy employment "in visiting the sick during the prevalence of Cholera" in the summer of 1835" was not taken advantage of, as you insinuate, by those "certain individuals;" since tjeu "went up to the Presbytery" and RETURNED, ( as you might have done ) at least five days before your busy employment commenced.

Thus it plainly appear, that THREE of your "Plain matters of fact," are sadly deficient in their foundations--to wit: your assumed connection with this church--The prevalence of Cholera in 1835, and your busy employment in "visiting the sick," &c.--- But I have not yet done with the ( truly Jesuitical ) paragraph quoted: which tho' comprised in SEVEN lines of your publication employs "nine presentations" and subversions of "plain matters of fact." So numerous , and so artful and mischievous, that PAGES are requisite to correct and expose them, as fully as they merit. And I shall fail in MY duty if I did not, on this occasion, thoroughly  
80 notice, and MARK THEM. Let us now enquire, who were those "certain individuals"? What was their errand to the Presbytery? And what the "bearing on this Church" of the Resolutions to which you allude, and which you so SINCERELY condemn. "The Record" informs us that Thomas Lindsay and James H. Black, two of the Ruling Elders of this Church, and one of its Deacons, Mr. Copes, went up to attend a Special meeting of the Presbytery, convened by regular appointment, at Greenfield, on the 5th day of June 1835; there to testify upon oath, in a case of complaint, that was sent up in April, from the Church of St. Charles, against the Rev. Hiram Chamberlain, for disturbing its peace.

There were three ministers and Six Elders present at this meeting of the Presbytery; Viz: David Nelson ( Moderator ), Sam'l C. Mc Connell, and GEO. C. WOOD, Ministers-- Joseph Lafon, John Mc Afee, Jas. F. Mahan, S. M. Grant, George Slaven and Thomas Lindsay, Elders.

The complaint being of a nature that called for no judicial action of the Presbytery, produced of course, nothing further than an act declaratory. This Act ( which appears to have passed nem. con, ) Sp far from being injurious or oppressive in its bearing on the Church was evidently intended to promote the  
81 object so earnestly sought in the memorial that accompanied the complaint, to wit: the restoration of peace and harmony, by the removal of its chief disturber; and in order to effect this, the Presbytery adopted among other, the following resolution: "Resolved further; that this Presbytery do, in the fear of God, earnestly request "Mr. Hiram to retire from the troubled region."

You Sir, AND NOT THE CHURCH, ( as you know full well ) complained of this act, and with "certain individuals" appealed from it to the Synod; where you were personally present with all your witnesses and documents, and had every facility and indulgence, that you could reasonably ask for, to make good YOUR complaint. But the Synod UNANIMOUSLY confirmed the act of Presbytery. After condemning in terms the most unequivocal, your attempt to distract and divide this church, and let yourself and coadjutors, up as Minister and ruling Elder therein. The Synod say, "Finally in view of all the circumstances of the case, Synod would "most affectionately advise Brother Chamberlain to seek another field of labour " than St. Charles." I refer you to my narrative, pages 14 to 18, for a more full account of all those proceedings of the Session, Presbytery and Synod, which  
82 account you will find to be carefully and faithfully taken from the records. And now Sir, from all that I have proven concerning the "plain matters of fact" involved in that most extraordinary paragraph that I have been commenting on so long and tediously; is it not clearly manifest that you have therein employed

82 "misrepresentations to subvert" them, in at least FIVE distinct averments? As you cannot deny this, I have a right to expect you to correct these errors also, into which you have led many of your DISTANT readers.

As to the pill, that "bitter pill", the beautiful figure you have chosen to characterize a certain declaration of the Missouri Presbytery IN YOUR OWN BEHALF; the DRASTICK effect of which on your "opponents" you so exultingly describe; I confess myself unable to perceive either the propriety or the wit of its introduction, in any connection with my church history. And as I am not in the use of QUACKERY of any sort, and do not permit myself to be numbered among YOUR opponents, in the ~~ERRY~~ sense in which you would apply the term, this ARGUMENT of yours is wasted; being wholly inapplicable to me personally.--

83 In my next I shall trouble you with some remarks on the contents of the 2nd page of your publication.

It may not be amiss to apprise you that as my time has been latterly, is yet, and will be for some time to come, very much occupied with other matters, that I may not neglect or postpone, it will probably be out of my power to conclude my examination of your pamphlet as early as I at first expected to do it. But I mean to complete the unpleasant task, sooner or later, if I live, and no unforeseen event prevents me.

Yr. Mst. OBT. Svt.

Geo. C. Sibley.

Linden Wood 17th February, 1838.

\* \* \*

84

Linden Wood 7th May 1838

Rev'd. Sir:

I avail myself of a leisure day, to continue my proposed notices of your pamphlet, and now ask your attention for a brief space, to a few remarks, etc., cited by the contents of your second page.

In the first place, suffer me, once for all, to correct one strange misapprehension that you have fallen into, which discovers itself throughout your publication, and in several instances, renders you quite ridiculous. I mean the ( rather arrogant ) notion that the "Church History" published by me in April 1837, must have been intended especially as a PERSONAL attack upon you—"to hunt YOU down by means of a printed book," — "to place YOURSELF, and friends, and the Presbytery of Missouri, in an unfavorable light before the PUBLIC." No such purpose had I in view I assure you; and you certainly much over strain the matter, and inflict yourself with much more trouble on this score, than there is any just occasion for. As I informed you in my communication of the 17th February last, it became my duty, as I conceived, to speak of you and your conduct, AS A PUBLIC MAN, in connection with the recent History, of this Church. Indeed, this was unavoidable, as every one must admit; and it will hardly be denied I think, that there did exist a propriety, to say the least, for collecting, arranging and preserving the material facts connected with this history—their publication was not intended for the "public at large", who little understand, or care for such matters; but for such persons as might be most immediately interested.

I had no motive or inclination to ATTACK you or to write one word concerning you in a spirit of personal hostility or unkindness, and I am much mistaken

85

and I am much mistaken if I have done so. What I HAVE written, is even yet, your "cross-examination" to the contrary notwithstanding, fully approved of by my deliberate judgment, after a careful review of the whole subject; not only as to the facts set forth in my narrative, but also as to the manner in which you and your actions in the events recorded, are mentioned. It would have been most unreasonable, I freely admit, on my part, to have been at the pains to write a BOOK, as you are pleased to style my pamphlet, purposely, or even indirectly, to hunt YOU down. No, no, Rev'd Sir; no such motive could possibly actuate me. That I am very far from being one of your admirers, either in your clerical or private character, is most true. In our natures and dispositions we can never assimilate; and I am willing to take to myself a full share of the fault or misfortune of the estrangement that lies between us; and whenever you cease to identify yourself with the History of the which of which I am a member, I shall cease to notice you in any manner at all calculated to arouse your fear or your hostility.

86

You are over fond of dealing in dark and injurious innuendos: thus on your 7th and 8th paragraphs 2nd page--you insinuate that altho' I was anxious to record my testimony against you on your preliminary trial, I took care to withhold some certain facts, that under my oath I was bound to state--and in another place, you throw out a dark insinuation touching my personal history; as if you could tell something about me "very interesting" clearly meaning to be understood that in your tender mercy you have chosen to suppress certain facts that are within your knowledge; which, if you had thought fit to indulge to your DISTANT readers would operate very injuriously to my reputation. It is really sickening to find a man of your calling so apt as you are to indulge in this contemptible sort of slander: and as I am somewhat your senior in years and experience, I trust you will not take offence Rev'd Sir, if I use the present occasion en passant, to administer to you a gentle rebuke, for your too frequent use of that truly hateful and sinful propensity, that so prominently marks all your controvertible labours. I mean, of course, that assassin-like weapon, THE INNUENDO, employed with the manifest intention of wounding character. This STABBING IN THE DARK, is a most vile and cowardly sort of ARGUMENT, unworthy to be employed by ANY honorable man, and vastly more unfit for use in the hands of an ordained minister of the pure and holy one. The favorite and most potent implement of Satans used in his unceasing warfare against our fallen race, is said to be pointed with this vindicative, secret poison. For your own sake, Rev'd Sir, I counsel you to abandon at once, the use of this disgraceful and disgracing weapon.

88

As respects my testimony before the commission of the Missouri Presbytery ( Messrs Yantis and Mc Afee ) in Sept. 1836, touching certain charges of common fame against you, on which you comment so much in the style of a Slanderer; and to which you take exception, impeaching my veracity, for the far fetched purpose of constructing one of your "incontrovertible proofs" that my History "CANNOT BE TRUE"; you will find, Sir, that you have again wandered from the record, and that like all your other wanderings, you have only the more exposed yourself to ridicule and contempt. No person acquainted with me, will for a moment believe your dark insinuations that I in any manner or form testified falsely against you on that or any other occasion; either by what I DID or DID NOT say; under oath or otherwise. For your special use, I will append to this note the whole of my testimony, including your cross-examination, which I shall carefully copy from the "OFFICIAL RECORD". It is not true, Sir, and I have reason to believe that YOU KNOW it is not true; that I anxiously sought to give testimony in the case--in point of fact I anxiously sought to avoid appearing as a Witness; and to



89 that end asked the chairman of the Commission to excuse me if he could properly do so; which he did not feel at liberty to do as I had been regularly summoned.

You remark in the 7th paragraph, 2nd page, about my withholding testimony in your case, tho' sworn to tell all I knew of it, evidently alludes to an expression in the sixth line of the "Introduction" to my "Narrative". Before you ventured to print and publish such ridiculous nonsense, you should have paid some little attention to dates. My testimony bears date 9th September 1836. My PAMPHLET, to which you allude bears date April 1837 ( it was published early in April ) Thus you see, Rev'd Sir, that about seven months intervened from the giving in of my testimony to the publication of the narrative; in which seven months I had opportunity to learn and know many facts touching our church disturbances and YOUR identity with them, that I could not possibly have known before, for the simple reason that they were not brought to light. You will not deny Sir, that within that period many material incidents occurred in connection with those disturbances and YOUR busy action therein. I submit this correction for your reflection, and to remind you how extremely inconsiderate you are sometimes in setting your little traps: they almost invariably catch your own fingers. What can be more ridiculous than your charging me with criminal omission when testifying under oath, because I did not tell things that were not yet to transpire? Verily Rev'd Sir, you honour me overmuch, in this ascribing to me the attributes of a prophet. And this my dereliction as a prophet, you set up as ANOTHER of your "incontrovertible proofs," that I am exceedingly unworthy historian; not to be believed at all by your DISTANT readers, who would thereby be misled. Now in sober seriousness Mr. Chamberlain, I put the question to your conscience; whether My "Narrative" or your "Cross Examination" is most likely to mislead and deceive? in the supposition, I mean, that your readers are careless enough to confide in your statements.

90 As touching the insinuation in the 8th paragraph, 2nd page, I invite you Rev'd Sir, to take the responsibility of publishing it in a more definite and tangible form so that it may be known precisely what you allude to, that I may if the matter is worthy of notice, hold you to the proof, and defend myself against your aspersions; which you very well know cannot be done as you have left the matter.

91 The 8th paragraph, 2nd page, also contain a criticism on an expression of mine wherein I make a distinction between "IMPRESSION" and "BELIEF", which distinction you affect to ridicule, and probably thus present it to your readers as another "incontrovertible proof" of the falsity of my narrative. As if the mind were not susceptible of impression in relation to passing events, upon which no positive BELIEF, that is to say, no CONVICTION can be justly entertained.

The expression to which you so wittily allude was used by me on the occasion of my replying to a very irrelevant question asked by yourself, when I was under examination as a witness in your case, and, with the view as I supposed to elicit my opinion as to the merits of the "BED QUILT STORY" as you called it; as well as to find out if I had ever been so wicked as to repeat the story.

92 Now with all due reference to your Superior erudition and critical acumen, allow me to say that my expression was correct and proper: not only good english, and just suited to the occasion, but conveying a fair exposition of the state of my mind in reference to the alleged breach of trust on your part, in withholding and wearing out the Rev'd. James Gallaher's Bed Quilt; and were you to ask me the same question NOW you would be very likely to receive the very same answer.. My "Impression" being still the same.

92

In the 10th & 11th paragraph, you again display your singular talent for verbal criticism, in the absurd attempt to establish the silly proposition that "party feeling" must necessarily exist, and consequently controul, wherever one person expressed disapprobation of the conduct of another. This precious morceau of logic you set upon and urge, to refute the declaration in the concluding sentence of my narrative, disclaiming any "party connection of party feeling", in the execution of my task.

93

But you will have it that my declaration is disengenious and untrue; because I had seven months previously confessed when testifying on oath, that I had for many years entertained, and expressed opinions unfavorable to come of YOUR official conduct. And THEREFORE PARTY FEELINGS must of necessity have been generated by such opinions; and CONSEQUENTLY my narrative MUST have been written and published in the spirit of party hostility to you and your friend; and then you jump triumphantly to the conclusion that the narrative is "~~written~~ utterly unworthy the confidence of any man or body of men - it cannot be true". And upon this conclusion you erect your grand "incontrovertible proof," to the total overthrow of "the BOOK" and its hopeless author.-- PROVIDED, I should say, your premises and logic, be sound: of which little circumstance you are evidently in doubt yourself--else why not stop there? Why struggle on through seven or eight pages more? Perhaps it may have occurred to you that this sort of reasoning might not be satisfactory to some of your readers; that according to this new theory of yours, all history that was ever written, scarcely excepting the mosaic, must lie under condemnation, or at least suspicion. But I believe I have elsewhere answered you on this point. I only notice it again more particularly, because I perceive you have made it your grand rallying point throughout your whole tirade.-- I am only yet on the threshold of your 3rd page, and have already pointed out so many striking instances of inemittical "misrepresentations" employed by you "to subvert plain matters of fact," that I might with propriety now take my leave of you and your pamphlet. But I shall still further proceed, ere long, to expose your errors and misstatements, which, as I have elsewhere said, do about through out the whole pamphlet. For your special use, I now copy from an authentic copy of "the record" in my possession, my own testimony before the commission of the Presbytery of Missouri in September 1836.

94

"In the case now pending before the Presbytery of Missouri, wherein common ~~fama~~ "is the accuser and Rev'd Hiram Chamberlain is the defendant, George C. Sibley "having been cited to appear as a witness before a commission of Presbytery in "the town of St. Charles, to testify in said case, and having been duly sworn "doth testify as follows, touching the several charges that have been recorded "and published against said Chamberlain by the Presbytery of St. Charles.

95

"As to the 1st charge witness declares that he knows nothing. As to the "2nd charge, witness says that he does not remember to have heard Mr. R.F. Gray "make the statement therein referred to. He does know, however, that if "Mr. Chamberlain's name had been before the St. Charles church at the time said "Gray was chosen minister, that he, Chamberlain, would not have had a majority "or anything like a majority. As to the 3rd charge, witness says that he knows "nothing. As to the 4th charge, witness says he knows nothing. As to the 5th "charge witness says that he knows it to be true. Witness has resided here "upwards of eight years, and for the greater part of that period has been acquaint- "ed with the state of the Presbyterian Church of St. Charles as respects its "peace and harmony, which were never disturbed in any serious degree before , "except by the several attempts of Mr. Chamberlain to become its minister--that "a remarkable degree of unanimity prevailed in the church and congregation at the "time of Mr. Chamberlain's arrival here in January 1835, having a short time "previously authorised the Session by a unanimous/ vote, to invite the Rev. F. R. "Gray to become their settled Pastor. It was whilst the negotiation with Mr.

Gray was pending, and before any definite answer had been made from him, that "Mr. Chamberlain appeared among us and suffered HIS pretensions ( to be minister of this church ) to be set up and enforced; and continued to urge them in defiance of the decided opposition of THREE out of the four Elders, and two of the three Deacons, and a decided majority of the members, as well as a large proportion of the congregation. An unhappy division has existed in the church during the whole period of Mr. Chamberlain's residence among us, which has not only disturbed and broken up the peace and harmony which previously existed so happily, but has spread its deleterious influence over the community, producing at times, angry excitement, which in the view of the witness have been and still are, highly injurious to the cause of religion and good order.--As to the 5th charge, witness says he knows nothing. Witness further declares that he has never had any personal acquaintance with Mr. Chamberlain--as an individual. witness has never entertained any hostile feelings toward him; though he confesses that from the beginning he had decidedly disapproved of his official course since his arrival here in January 1835 and has freely expressed that disapprobation on many occasions, both by word and acts. All which the witness declares to be true to the best of his knowledge and belief.

G. S. Sibley.

St. Charles, Sept. 9th, 1836.

\*\*\*\*\*

Cross-examination by Mr. Chamberlain.

Ques: Have you ever reported the Bed Quilt Story?

Ans: I have frequently heard it spoken of, and have probably spoken of it myself-- it was a matter of common rumor.

Ques: Have you, or have you not ever expressed any belief of it's truth since the Session of Synod last fall?

A: Cannot state whether I have so expressed my impression since the meeting of Synod--tho' I believe I have expressed my impression and my belief, that there was too much truth in the report.

Q: Have you ever stated to anyone the report of my dishonesty in money matters relative to the Boonville Church?

A: I believe I have.-- The report was common rumor. I have received IMPRESSION from the current reports that induced me to fear there was too much truth in it.

Q: Have you any personal knowledge of the truth of any of these reports?

A: I have not.

Q: Have you been a member of the church for some time?

A: Since February,-- Early in February.-- I joined which Mr. Cochran was here, who acted as Moderator of the Session.

Q: Have you ever come to me to labor with me as a Christian Brother, in reference to any of these difficulties? A: No.

Q: Have you ever had any personal intercourse with me?--

A: No, I have never in my life had any personal intercourse with you.

Q: Had you heard of all these charges previous to their publication?

A: I do not think I had,-- there are some things there that I had not heard before.

Q: Do you know of any particular act of mine, and from the fact of my being here, calculated to disturb the peace of the church? A: I do not.

Q: How did you know that if I had been a candidate at this time, Mr. Gray was chosen Minister, that I should not have a majority of votes?

A: Because a proposition to vote for other persons was decidedly negated by the meeting. The meeting, as I believe, was held for the express purpose of inviting Mr. Gray.

Q: Did any of my friends speak of me as a candidate at that meeting?

A: The meeting was, as I remember and believe, for the express purpose of inviting Mr. Gray; and no other person was nominated that I remember, and for the reason that it was a Special meeting, ~~would have been voted for~~

the purpose I have stated. I feel confident that no other person would have been voted for.

Q: Do you know that my friends had been assured by me that I would not be a candidate before this church if they were divided?

A: I know nothing of the matter.

Q: Do you know that the church had any prospect of having Mr. Gray at that time?

A: I do not know--but presume they had or they would not have invited him.

Q: Did you or did you not, say, after a meeting of the Bible Society that if Mr. Chamberlain came here you would attend his preaching?

A: I do not think I ever made any such remark-- because I well remember, that in the conversation alluded to I warned those who were present, that if Mr. Chamberlain came here as a Minister of the Gospel, there would be a disturbance in the church.

Q: Was that conversation in this house? A: Yes, it was in the other room, standing by the fire.

Q: Was it on the 1st Monday in January 1835? A: Yes, it was at the meeting of the Bible Society in January 1835.

Q: When did your opposition to me commence? A. Many years ago--when I heard of the difficulties with Mr. Giddings.

This testimony was read to and approved by the witness. B. Orrick, Clk.

---

NOTE: The charges referred to in my testimony will be found in Mr. Chamberlain's pamphlet of July 1836 ( annexed to this ) But they are not there numbered as they are docketed--That number 5 should be 2--that number 7 should be 5.

G. C. S.

---

98 Rev. Sir: As I find myself at the close of the day very unexpectedly liable to be interrupted after today, in these notices of you "PROOFS", and know not how long I may be obliged by absence and other causes, to suspend the matter; I will endeavour NOW before I lay it aside, to complete what I have to say in reference to your 2nd and 3rd PROOFS as they are set forth on pages 3 & 4, paragraph 12 to 16 inclusive.

And I may as well apprise you at once; that, as it appears to my mind, I have already sacrificed more time and labour on your pamphlet than it merits even called for.-- For me to PUBLISH any reply, I am persuaded would be perfectly useless. Wherever your pamphlet is read in connection with mine it will be found to carry its own reputation on almost every page; and as to the rest, I have, in my two preceding communications, sufficiently exposed you and your Jesuitical unfairness to satisfy any impartial mind, that nothing BUT misrepresentation can be looked for in such a reckless production as yours. NEVERTHELESS, I shall, as my leisure permits, go through with what I have commenced; more for YOUR benefit than for any other purpose, as I have no idea of taxing the PUBLIC hereabout, or elsewhere, with any further discussions of our church affair, so far as you are or ever can be, concerned with them. I shall, however, retain copies of all I write to you, for my own reference, and the perusal of any others who may express a desire to do so.

99 Altho' my statements as to the arraying of "colored members who are slaves" against you, is substantially true in fact, and correct in language; and cannot, I am confident, mislead any candid reader. Yet, I amwilling to admit, that I might have EXPRESSED my (obvious) meaning in terms better guarded against your CAVILLING disposition; and should probably have done so, if I had know at the time what was to betide my narrative.

Or if I had been then, as I am now, aware of your Jesuitical ingenuity in totturing language and facts to suit your own purposes.--- You cannot but have noticed, Sir, that wherever I have mentioned the comparative numerical force of the "PARTIES" into which your intermingling has divided this church; that the COLORED

members have been set down distinct and separate, and in no instance have they ever been enumerated indiscriminately with the white members. This much for my narrative. And it is also perfectly true, as to the action of our Session in their official complaints to the Presbytery against you, that the same caution was used in naming the colored members separately, in their reported classification of the members of this church. The paper to which you allude, dated 20th May, 1835, gives the names of the members of the church, as borne on the Session Book, and thus classifies them: First those who stood with the Session in a column on the left hand; Second, those ashering or claimed as adhering to Mr. Chamberlain, in a column on the right hand.-- third the names of the Colored members in a separate column between the two others and distinctly designated "BLACK MEMBERS".-- Rev. G. C. Wood, clerk of the Presbytery, in a note transmitting me a copy of said document, says that it "was not recognized as the regular report of Session, but merely as appertaining to the complain of Session, &c." In point of fact, the "Black Members" named WERE opposed to you, but they were never in any manner arrayed against you, except in the giving of their names as adhering to the Session; which was certainly in no respect improper, and with all your ingenuity you cannot torture this to bear out in the obvious meaning of the language employed in your appeal. Nor can you be sustained in your charge of FORGERY against the Session, on the ground that those Black Members did not, and could not subscribe their own names--upon this ground you venture to accuse the session and their supporters with "using papers with unauthorized signatures," and in reply to my notice of the accusation of "FORGERY" ( page 16, p. 5 ) you enter a miserably poor quibble; the WORD forgery you say, it not used by you--this is true, but you use WORDS intended to convey, and that DO convey the same meaning. To sustain your charge you must show that those Black members did not authorise their names to be used: which you have not attempted to do-- And I need not remind you Sir, who is so familiar with subscription, petitions, memorials and documents of like nature, that it is the every day practise for persons who CAN write to authorise others to append their names to such papers--there may be some impropriety in this custom, ~~and that~~ in STRICTNESS; but you very well know it TO BE the custom, and that no harm arises from it; or any CRIME or any just censure attaches to it--in the instance that YOU complain of, and erect so triumphantly into an "incontrovertible proof" of the falsity of my narrative--those black members DID authorise the Session to record their names on the papers alluded to, just as they stand there. The solemn manner in which you interrogated witnesses to DISPROVE, what no one ever asserted--that those colored members did or could write., was a remarkable display of pettifogging, and a striking proof that people reduced to certain extremities will "catch at straws."

In your 3rd proof, you charge against me and my narrative, an improper use of "inverted comma" in quoting from your appeal,--this is an error of the press. The original Mss. ( which is at your service ) confines the quotation marks to the words "an oppressive yoke," as the print does pretty plainly show was my intention. Here again you higgel about mere words. Not regarding the obvious meaning of your language--all the rest of this flimsy argument, if argument it can be called, has been already fully announced.

Here I must take leave of you, Rev. Sir, and your pamphlet for the present, I hope yet to go through with my review, tho' I do not mean to hurry myself, or to impose upon myself any inconvenience at all in so doing, there is no occasion for it.

Yr. very Obt. Svt.

G. C. SIBLEY.

Linden Wood, May 28th, 1838

Rev. Sir: In the course of the present week I shall endeavour to acquit myself of all my obligation touching your cross examination on "Major" Sibley's Church History", by cross examining on my part, the testimony upon which you have erected the remaining six "INCONTROVERTIBLE PROOFS" set forth in your pamphlet, with the view of controverting the facts and influences employed in my sketches of "Church History" &c. In my last correspondence ( of the 7th ins. ) I had progressed so far in MY cross examination as to the 16th paragraph, inclusive, on your fourth page. I now address myself to your FOURTH PROOF, occupying paragraph 17 to 21 inclusive. Your object here is particularly to fix on me the charges of "FLAGRANT INJUSTICE", partiality and gross misrepresentation of facts, as to YOUR personal participation in the unhappy disturbances that have mared the peace of our church since January 1835. You claim a comfortable acquittal of all such participation, upon the judgment of your Presbytery; which exonerated you from all blame, except such as may be fairly infered from your COMING and BEING and STAYING here; which acts of yours. the Presbytery declares to have been the OCCASION merely, and not the cause of "much strife and disturbance" in our church; &c. And you censure me very severely, because I am so stupid as not to understand the great moral difference between COMING and OCCASIONING mischief; and for my temerity in venturing to oppose my opinion against the practical effect, as well as the correctness of the judgment under which you claim entire immunity to perpetrate the OCCASION of our troubles. My respect for all those who composed your Presbytery is unfeigned, and I know very well how to appreciate the difficulties and embarrassments under which they acted and decided in your case--arising from the entire omission of St. Charles Presbytery ( the complainant ) to appoint or authorise any one to prosecute their charges; they leaving you the full benefit of your adroitness. Important testimony was probably rejected, and some other withheld, or very imperfectly elicited--and you Sir, did avail yourself of all these advantages ( I do not blame you ) to the full extent of your ability; appealing to your judges and the bystanders for their sympathy, with tears and pathos ( as you very well know how ) under the assumed character of a "PERSECUTED GOSPEL MINISTER". I will not take upon myself to aver, that the judgment would have been very different, if BOTH SIDES had been heard in the pleading; if the complainant had been properly represented to arrange, BRING FORWARD, and examine the testimony, and to set it forth in all its just force and bearing, before the Presbytery of Missouri; but my mind cannot reject the "IMPRESSION" that under such circumstances the result MIGHT have been quite different. As it is, I am even yet, unable to discover much cause for your exultation. You have been pronounced by your judges to have been the "OCCASION" if not the CAUSE of our church disturbance. Now my mind is even yet so obtuse, as to this nice point, that I cannot, as you labor to convince me, perceive the difference, as applied to YOUR case. Let us appeal to Webster's large quarto Dictionary:--

"TO CAUSE"-- to produce, bring into existence--to effect by agency, power or influence." ( the agent by which an effect is produced

"CAUSER-- He that causes or produces--either incidentally or otherwise."

"OCCASIONER-- One that causes or produces--

CAUSING-- producing--effecting--bringing into being."

"OCCASIONING--causing incidentally, or otherwise--"

Abstractly "to occasion" is not ALWAYS synonymous with "to cause", not is it always different. Circumstances must always govern in this, to make distinctions or not--thus-- If H. C. comes to St. Charles as a mere passer-by on his way home from St. Louis to Franklin; and the members of a church fall into a dispute whether they shall invite him to remain a few weeks among them to preach, and the dispute appearing likely to grow into a serious strife and disturbance, the said H. C. should promptly depart " the trouble region", and keep himself entirely aloof from said people; he could not justly be chargeable with their strife, as its CAUSE, tho' he would clearly have been the innocent OCCASION thereof-- And should

104

105

106

it continue and increase, he, H. C., would certainly be exempt from all blame, PROVIDED he honestly abstained from all connection or correspondence with either party, as identifying himself with them in the strife.

107 But if H. C. passively allowed himself, or his name to be used by either party as their rallying point, so to speak--settled himself among them; officiated as their preacher and pastor--and against the private advice and entreaty of his brethren in the ministry, as well as the advice and counsel of Presbytery and Synod; and opposition of the other party; I do not think I can be in error, if I conclude that such a course of conduct on the part of H. C. would be eminently calculated to foment the strife and disturbance of said church and community, and render him justly obnoxious to the imputation of not only OCCASIONING but CAUSING the disturbance--applied to such circumstances, the two terms OCCASION and CAUSE, would be undoubtedly synonymous, according to the definition given by Webster; and every other Lexicographer that I am acquainted with.

Now, Sir, even admitting ( what you know is by no means true ) that yours was merely a PASSIVE instrumentality, in which you really took no other action, that to COME, to BE, and to STAY. Yet, if to COME, to BE, and STAY, most manifestly had the effect to promote strife, and you were master of your own actions; I contend that such conduct, passive or not, was just suited to CAUSE the disturbance complained of; and at the same time afford you some pretext for denying any part or agency therein. Your illustration in the 20th paragraph, tho' ingenious, as you may think, are in my mind, but weak auxiliaries. A modest, spotless lady may, or may not be, the innocent occasion of a duel. If she openly identifies herself with either party, IN SUCH MANNER AS IS JUST CALCULATED TO IRRITATE THE OTHER, and a duel follows; she is not only the occasion, but the CAUSE of the duel--and tho' she might not be legally criminal; her own conscience, as well as public sentiment, would most certainly reproach her very severely.

108 Your other examples, especially those that you effect to draw from Scripture; are inapplicable to the occasion, and in very bad taste, to say the least of them-- Neither St. Paul, or far less, our Blessed Saviour, was ever the CAUSE or the OCCASION of disturbing the church. So as to distract and divide it ---the very allusion YOU make to Paul And Apollos, proves that the Apostle was preaching union and peace; not allowing HIS name to be used as an OCCASION for "strife and disturbance."

I maintain now, again and again, that you HAVE disturbed the peace of this church not only passively, but actively, and are yet its disturber; and 'tis nonsense for you to pretend, that because "I KNOW" this to be true, I am therefore incapable of writing a correct narrative of events in which YOU happen to be a conspicuous actor. Others less warped by prejudice that you are, have judged differently.--

109 As to the judgment of the Missouri Presbytery, I still believe it erroneous-- It is neither justified by the evidence of record, before them; nor by OTHER testimony that ought to have been exhibited to them-- In the judgment that I have pronounced, upon my responsibility as a "Historian" I have not been influenced SOLELY by recorded testimony, and the inferences of other men, ( whether acting individually or as a Presbytery ) I had the light of other facts, many of which were unknown in November 1836, to your Presbytery, but had come to light before April 1837,-- and might have been used on your trial, if our St. Charles Presbytery, as prosecutor, had not omitted the essential act of appointing a fit person to conduct the proceedings on THEIR part.

You main, if not sole, reliance, for proof of you entire exemption from any share in the "DISTURBANCE" is the declaration of the Presbytery that they had not able with all their anxious scrutiny, to discover any proof of any criminal act of yours, connected with the disturbance; and you smugly ensconce yourself under

the plea that the ACTS of COMING and BEING and STAYING in the troubled region, with the full knowledge of their consequential influence to engender and promote strife; only contributed THE INNOCENT OCCASION of mischief. But, Sir, did you not by letter from Franklin to Mr. A. Campbell afford encouragement to him and "your friend" to persist in their course of disunion? You cannot deny that you did. And was not this ACT, exactly INTENDED to PRODUCE, to CAUSE disunion, and consequently strife and disturbance? Di you not further promote disunion by actually COMING down from Franklin, with the avowed purpose ( previously announced in the letter to Mr. Campbell ) of officiating as minister and advisor to those who had invited you, contrary, as you well know, to the official, solemn protest of the Session? And did you not still further foment the dissention, by giving your countenance to the unlawful election by "your friends" of three new Elders? in this you ACTED by presiding at the meeting, and over the election. And have you not to this day continued your active agency in the premises, in spite of all remonstrances of friends, and church indicators--upon the miserable pretext that because you have been the OCCASION of disunion--disorder-- strife and disturbance in this church; and the active means of organizing a number of its members into a separate church, contrary to Presbyterian Law, you are BOUND to continue the same?

Really it seems to me supremely ridiculous in YOU to make pretensions to that placid-passive disposition, that would entitle you, in any case, where your interest is concerned, to the benefit of being esteemed the mere innocent or irresponsible occasioner of the disturbance of our church. Your temper and disposition are too well known, to admit of any such plea. And I do not think you deal fairly with your "party" in thus quietly and artfully throwing upon THEM the whole blame of CAUSING, whilst you only occasioned the mischief that has been perpetrated. True, you affect to lay the whole blame upon the old officers of the church, on the ground that it was their duty to have sanctioned your pretensions, etc., but I apprehend, Rev. Sir, that you cannot be serious in submitting such an idle suggestion, any further than as a sort of blind to "your friend" to keep out of view as much as possible, how adroitly you have USED them to effect your own VERY DISINTERESTED purposes.--

The charge of disturbing the peace of the St. Charles church, is indeed laid against you in my narrative, and it is true, as you say, a material object with me NOW to sustain it; tho' it was by no means the leading object of "the pamphlet".

In addition to what has already been advanced on the subject, I will now copy from "the Record" minutes of the Synod of Missouri: The testimony of Dr. B. Graham and Mr. A. B. Campbell. These gentlemen were brought forward by yourself to testify before Synod in your case, chiefly with the view of moving your charge of tyranny and oppression against the Elders, Lindsay, Watson and Black, in order to justify Elder Campbell and "your friends" in their factious opposition to the Session of the church--and to prove, also, that there was opposition made to Mr. Gray in the church--and also that YOU had the support of a majority of the members of said church. In all which views and expectations you were disappointed. I cannot find this testimony recorded in the proceedings of the Missouri Presbytery in your case, and conclude it was not laid before them.-- I give as much of it here as may be revelant, and shall refer to it probably, in my further notices of your "INCONVERTIBLE PROOFS."

"Dr. Beriah Graham's testimony:--

Ques. ( By Mr. Chamberlain) Do you know of any divisions previous to my coming to St. Charles? Ans. I do not.

Q: What is the public and general feeling of the people of St. Charles concerning the Session---were they considered oppressive? Ans: I have heard it spoken of, both by members of the ch. & those not members, in that way.

Q: What are the oppressive acts of the Session. A: I know of none personally.-- it is a common report.



- Q: Do you think the people really would have been united in Mr. Gray.  
 A: Yes, previous to Mr. Chamberlain's coming there.  
 Q: Do you think Mr. Chamberlain's coming to St. Charles has been the cause of most good or evil?--  
 A: Can't tell--there is mos division that there was.

\* \* \* \*

Alex. B. Campbell's testimony--

- Ques: Whether the majority of that congregation have not felt themselves oppressed by the Session. A: Yes.
- 113 Q: How long prior to Mr. Chamberlain's coming to St. Charles did the oppression of the Session exist?  
 A: But little said about it.  
 Q: What has the Session done which has been oppressive since you have been acquainted with it?  
 A: Can't tell.  
 Q: How long have you been a member of the Session?  
 A: About two years and a half.  
 Q: Have you known of any oppressive acts of the Session in that time? A. No.  
 Q: Was there any such division in the church prior to Mr. Chamberlain's coming to St. Charles that they could not have united in some other man?  
 A: Unanimous in Mr. Gray.  
 Q: Was it likely there would have been a union of the church had Mr. Gray gone to St. Charles?  
 A: Likely there would.  
 Q: Was it really the desire of the people to get Mr. Gray? A. Yes.  
 Q: What was the number of your paper when Mr. Chamberlain was called?  
 A: Fifty-six.  
 Q: How many were members? Ans. Thirty-three.  
 Q: In making out the record of the number 56 the person calling for Mr. Chamberlain, were not some of the names excepted? ANS. According to the best of his knowledge they were.  
 Q: How many persons have you received into the church since the last Elders were made?  
 A: Fourteen on certificate examination.  
 Q: How many have left Mr. Chamberlain's party and joined those opposed?  
 A: Five.
- 114 Q: How many members are in the part of the church to which you belong?  
 A: Thirty-eight.  
 Q: Do you know what proportion of the members were present at the election.  
 A: A majority.  
 Q: Was there a majority of the whole church-- i. e. those in communion who voted?  
 A: I think there was not.  
 Q: Did all who signed the subscription for a preacher, vote for Mr. Chamberlain?  
 A: I think one or two did not.  
 Q: Did not go to hear Rev. Wood? Ans. Yes.  
 Q: Did they not all love him?  
 A: I never hear them express themselves otherwise.  
 Q: Did you say that all the difficulties grew out of Mr. Chamberlain's coming here?-- Yes--  
 Q: Was there any division in the church during those years before Mr. Chamberlain came among you?  
 A: There was. Q: On what account? ANS. Relating to Bro. Wood, a few being opposed to him.  
 Q: Was there any division after Mr. Wood left you and before you got Mr. Chamberlain.

A: Some little diversity of opinion respecting their minister.

\* \* \* \*

115 Whilst I have "The Record" before me ( now bear it in mind, Sir, that I quote from the AUTHENTICATED RECORD ) I will copy out from the testimony of the other witnesses, such facts as they state upon oath, bearing upon your boasted "proofs"--

I now refer you to the record of the testimony taken by "THE COMMISSION" of your Presbytery in St. Charles in Sept. 1836.

\* \* \* \*

Benjamin R. Wardlaw-- on the part of the accused.

Ques. How many votes were taken in fav'r of Mr. Chamberlain at the meeting called by Mr. Campbell about the 22nd February 1835, being shortly after the Elders had refused?

A: I believe there was about thirty-four, including members of the church AND CONGREGATION.

Q: Can you tell how many of those who were members at the time of that election are now attached to Mr. Chamberlain's party? Ans. I believe about fifteen.

Q: by Mr. C.--What number of the present members of the ch. are now favorable to me, as far as you know?

A: There are about 38 I believe to be favorable--one of these is under consideration by Session. The adherence of another is disputed, and one other is living out of bounds of this church. The adherence of one other is also disputed.

\* \* \* \*

Mr. Wardlaw you know, acted as Secretary of the meeting and election, 22nd Feby, 1835; and is clerk of your Session.

\* \* \* \*

Eliab Jenkins--on the part of the accused:-

Q: Is there a considerable number opposed to Mr. Chamberlain?

A: There is now a considerable number opposed to him, bitterly opposed to him.

Q: Has this been the case for some time?

A: It has. There is a good many that signed to his preaching, and when Mr. Thomas Lindsay's Society came round, they signed back to go with them.

Q: How do you account for their peace being disturbed?

A: They have broeken off from us and go to the Methodist Church to hear preaching. They used to meet here with us until Mr. Chamberlain came.

Q: Do you conceive that the breach between those who are for Mr. Chamberlain and against him, is widening or diminishing? A: We are going further and further apart. I think we can never come together again in this world.

116

Q: What means did they use to induce them to draw off from Mr. Chamberlain?

A: Mr. Lindsay said that the wolves had scattered the sheep and that he was endeavouring to collect them again. He observed to us that we were running a great risk to go to hear Mr. Chamberlain preach.

Q: When Mr. Lindsay spoke of the wolves scattering the sheep, did he speak of me as the Wolf?

A: He did of course--that was my understanding.

Q- by Com.: What reason have you for believing that Mr. Lindsay refered to Mr. Chamberlain as the Wolf who scattered the skeep? A: It just came into my mind at that time that he WAS the one who scattered them, and Mr. Lindsay was the one that gathered them together.

Q: Did Mr. Lindsay or any one with him, at that time, speak of Mr. Chamberlain as the Wolf who scattered the flock?

A: Not particularly.

Q-by accused: When you said that Mr. Lindsay spoke of the Wolf scattering the sheep

it came to mind that I was the Wolf, or that <sup>you</sup> thought Mr. L. referred to me as the wolf?

A: I thought Mr. Lindsay referred to Mr. Chamberlain as the wolf who scattered the sheep.

Q: Was there a state of peace and quietship prevailing in this ch. before Mr. Chamberlain came here?--

A: I did not know that there was any fracas among us except when we were about to get a preacher.

Q: Do you refer to getting Mr. C., or generally. ANS. Generally.

Q: Did you ever have anything like the present disturbance in your church before? ANS. No, never anything like this before-- this beats all.

\* \* \* \* \*

Mrs. Amy Garvin--( on the part of the prosecution )

Q: How long have you been a member of the church of St. Charles?

A: Twelve years--this coming November.

118 Q: Has the church been SERIOUSLY disturbed before Mr. Chamberlain came to it?

A: If it was, I was not acquainted with it.

Q: Do you know of any disturbance between Mr. Lindsay and any of those ministers (Smith, Robinson, Wood, Preston, Hale, Nichols )-during their stay here?

A: There was a difference of opinion between Mr. Wood and Mr. Lindsay. But Mr. Wood said he regarded Mr. L as the father of the church, and would not stay longer.

Q: Did this difference between them, amount to any SERIOUS interruption between them?

A: I never knew that it did--they parted in peace and harmony as far as I know.

Q: Did you ever hear of any acts of oppression committed by Mr. Lindsay or the Session? ANS. Never.

Q: Did Mr. Lindsay or any other person ever endeavour to draw you off from Mr. Wood? ANS. No, indeed sir. I never did withdraw from him- And always wished him to stay.

Q: Do you know anything of the fact charge, of Mr. Chamberlain's going thro' that part of the church favorable to his views, and designating the persons proper to be elected? ANS: I certainly believe he did.

Q: Do you know anything of Mr. Chamberlain's disturbing the peace of the St. Charles church?

A: My peace has been much disturbed , and I presume the peace of many others.

Q: Has this been the case ever since Mr. Chamberlain came to St. Charles?

A: Not until they determined to elect new Elders. I was not disturbed by Mr. Chamberlain's remaining here for the first six months or year-- I was anxious to have preaching and willing to hear him for a short time.

Q: by accused: Do you know of any evil personally of me?

118 A: I did not like your going around choosing Elders. As you could not get in at the door, you seemed determined to JUMP OVER anyhow. I did not think any Christian would do it.

Q: Do you know that I chose any officers? ANS. I do not know that YOU CHOSE any officers. But you were asking the opinion of your friends respecting particular men.

Q: How do you know that I was asking the opinion of my friends?

A: I do not know anything further than that you asked Mr. Jenkins opinion respecting William Spencer.

Q: Did any of the members of the church displease you in electing Elders?

A: I thought they did wrong in being controlled, if they were controlled, to do so--there was but a handful of us; and it was calculated to make a division.

Q: Why did you think they were controlled?

A: It was the first time the like had ever been done?

- Q: Was that the first election of Elders that had been done?  
 A: It was not the first election--but it had always been that the old Elders had had a say in the matter, and it was a friendly unanimous proceeding.  
 Q: Do you know that I went through the WHOLE CHURCH favorable to my views designating Elders? A. I do not know.  
 Q: Do you say then that it/<sup>not</sup> was my conduct nor preaching that disturbed your peace? ANS. It was not anything I saw, but the division in the church, the setting aside the main stay of the church.  
 Q: What do you call the main stay of the church?  
 A: I consider that those who have taken an active part heretofore in the ch., and those to whom the Preachers generally looked for support, and in the management of our Sabbath Schools and Bible Societies, and public institutions.  
 Q: Had I set them aside? ANS: I do not know who had done it, nor what had done it, but it has been done since you came here.  
 \* \* \* \* \*

Dr. Andrew Wilson--on the part of the accused.

- 119 Q: Has the peace of the church been disturbed?  
 A: The church is divided, and I suppose the division grew out of the hostility of some persons who were opposed to your coming here.  
 Q: When Mr. Gray was elected did all the members of the church vote for him?  
 A: It appears that they all did vote for him. ( the Doctor had before stated that he was present at the meeting.)  
 Q: Was there any withdrawing from the preaching of Mr. Wood?  
 A: I do not know that there was any.  
 \* \* \* \* \*

Dr. Wilson never has been a member of any church.

Benjamin Emmons, Sen. --on the part of the accused.

- Q: What occurred at the meeting at which Mr. Gray was chosen minister?  
 A: I believe the meeting was called for the express purpose of giving Mr. Gray a call. Mr. Gray was invited unanimously--the meeting was pretty full; there was some discussion on the right of suffrage, and witness is not prepared to state whether the vote was confined to church members or not. Witness did not vote.  
 Q: Was the proceeding considered merely nominal?  
 A: I considered that it was their intention to invite Mr. Gray for a year.  
 Q: Did you hear the remarks of Maj. Sibley and Dr. Graham? A. I heard part of them, but became dissatisfied and retired.  
 Q: Was any one authorised to propose my name?  
 A: I do not know,--there was a desire to propose other names; but the congregation did not seem to wish an other.  
 Q: by accused:-Do you know anything of "an unhappy division" which "has existed "during the whole period of my residence among them, which has not only "broken up the peace and harmony that previously existed so happily in the "church, but has spread its deleterious influence over the community; producing at times, angry excitement: which has been and still is, highly injurious "to the cause of Religion and good order?"  
 \* \* \* \* \*

This question is a quotation from the testimony of G. C. Sibley, previously recorded, before the commission.

- 120 A: There has been an unhappy difference here in the church. The main point seems to be who shall rule; the majority or minority--the party that supports Mr. Chamberlain have harmonised very well together, and also the opposite party. There has been considerable excitement between the two parties, and some hard things said, especially of Mr. Chamberlain by those who are opposed

to him. I know of no act of Mr. Chamberlain, which ought to have produced such a state of things.

- Q: Could you say that the peace and good order of the church has never been disturbed except by me in the last eight years, in any serious degree?
- A: The difficulty that occurred when Mr. Wood was here was APPROACHING to seriousness, and had the majority then asserted their rights, I believe things would have been equally serious as they are now.

Mr. Emmons had never been connected with any church, or made any profession of religion, when his testimony was taken. Stripped of his opinions and inferences ( which of course could not be rec'd as testimony ) his facts so far as he knew of any, do substantiate the statements of G.C.S. and other witnesses touching the actual existence and peculiar character of the disturbance. The witness having been a warm partisan of Mr. C. may be somewhat excusable for not being able to attach any blame to any of his conduct.

121 The whereabouts of the MAJORITY and MINORITY are ascertained from much more reliable sources than the imperfect knowledge of Mr. Emmons. This witness deposes in another part of his examination.

- Q: You say that a very large majority wished to invite Mr. Chamberlain, What do you mean by that majority?
- A: I would suppose that putting aside the Black members, there was very nearly three fourths of the members voted for him. The number of votes for Mr. C. was not counted.

\* \* \* \* \*

This supposition of Mr. Emmons would give Mr. C. "very nearly" 44 votes of members. But Mr. Wardlaw, the Secretary of the meeting, swears that Mr. C. received only about 34 votes, including members of the church and CONGREGATION--and that only about 15 of those members then voting were attached to Mr. Chamberlain's party at the time he testified--Sept. '36.

So far from proving any acts of oppression against the Elders Lindsay, Black and Watson; your two witnesses before Synod, Graham and Campbell declare they knew of no such acts, tho' Campbell himself had been a member of Session for two years and a half. They both prove, also, that there was perfect unanimity in the invitations to Mr. Gray, as do also your other witnesses, Emmons and Wilson. Even if any disturbance DID exist previously to YOUR coming her ( which the proved unanimity in calling Mr. Gray contradicts ) your own witnesses prove that it was very much increased; and the disunion more and more WIDENED by your COMING, BRING and STAYING here.

You must excuse me for a little digression here from the precise matter in hand--In your 4th paragraph you refer to your first publication of July '36, and complainingly or rather, exultingly, remark that your reputation of the charges against you had remained unanswered. For your accommodation I will make some remarks here touching the SECOND and FIFTH charges, inasmuch as they are connected with each other, and TOGETHER, are by no means irrelevant to the subject now under consideration.

- 122 You MEET the 2nd charge ( numb. 3rd in your pamphlet ) by affecting to ridicule it: Styling it "vague and trifling," and the Missouri Presbytery in their "judgment" declare it "trifling and unimportant" and rebuke the St. Charles Presbytery very severely, for preparing <sup>it</sup> against you. Saying that "The exhibition of such charges evinces in our judgment a very ~~unbecomingly censorious and fault~~ finding and reprehensible spirit, on the part of those, whosoever they may be,

that have engaged in hunting them up." Here I may be allowed to say that if the St. Charles Presbytery had been properly represented at that trial, the above censure and rebuke would most probably have been spared; and a very different aspect given to this charge. The charge reads thus:

"Mr. Chamberlain told Mr. F. R. Gray, that if his name, that is Chamberlain's, had been before the St. Charles Church, at the time said Gray was chosen minister, he, said Chamberlain, would have had a majority of votes." As to this charge Rev. F. R. Gray testifies before the Missouri Presbytery as follows.

Q: Did Mr. Chamberlain make the statement as contained in the second charge to you?

A: Not precisely in that form: but he did make such statements as left the impression on my mind, that had there been a probability I would have accepted the invitation from the church of St. Charles, there would have been opposition to me, as there would to him or any one else.

Q: Was there anything said about what would have been the probable result of an election between you and Mr. Chamberlain, had you both been in nomination?

A: Nothing.-- Mr. Chamberlain DID state that there was opposition made when my name was put in nomination--he DID state that there was opposition to him, and named the number in such way, as to leave the impression, that there was about the same, in one case as in the other.

Q: Did Mr. C. make the statement to you con'd in the 6th charge?  
( This is number 8 in your pamphlet )

AP Mr. Chamberlain DID state that there were BUT THREE OPPOSED to HIM in fact in sentiment, but that there were TEN OTHERS who under the influence of those THREE would act against him.

Q: At what time did he make the statement about the TEN or the THREE being opposed to him? was it upon his invitation to go there for six weeks, or upon his invitation to settle there? ANS: The conversation in which these statements were made, was just after his return from the six weeks visit.

Q: Do you know anything in relation to the fifth charge ( the 7th in your pamphlet )

A: I can state, that I did receive two or three letters about the time of Mr. Chamberlain's six weeks visit to the church of St. Charles, urging me to accept the invitation of St. Charles, and the probability that if I did not, Mr. Chamberlain would settle there, and if he did, the peace of the ch<sup>h</sup> would be entirely destroyed.

Q: Who wrote those two or three letters you referred to?--

A: They were by Thomas Lindsay, Sam'l Watson and Jas. H. Black, Elders of St. Charles church; and Mr. Sibley--one of them I received while Mr. Benj. R. Wardlaw was on a visit to Columbia, who did substantiate to some considerable extent, the statement I found these letters to contain. This Mr. W. did in conversation between him and myself about the St. Charles affair.

Q.-by accused: What statement did Mr. Wardlaw sustain?

A: He sustained the statement of the probability that if I refused to accept the invitation from St. Charles church, that Mr. Chamberlain would settle there; that there was opposition to his coming, and that it would probably disturb the peace of the church.-- Mr. W. did intimate at least, that there had been dissatisfaction in the ch: on former occasions--That this measure would probably produce a division--that some dreaded such a result; and others said let it come.

Q: Did I state that there but THREE REALLY opposed to me, and but 13 NOMINALLY opposed to me?

A: I think it probable that that was your language.

Q: Was not that a confidential conversation?

A: There were some things mentioned that seemed of a confidential character. The conversation was in a public room in a tavern where Mr. C. boarded, and one or more persons passed thro' this room during the conversation, but did not make

any stay. The subject was also referred to in the sick chamber.-- Mr. C. did also say that he felt it to be his duty to apprise me of the state of things in St. Charles, in case I should have thought of going there.

Q: Are you sure that you use my precise language?

A: I am not sure of the precise language--the conversation was introduced by Mr. C. asking me if I had understood that he had been supplanting me in St. Charles. I replied it was difficult to supplant what which had never been planted.-- Upon which the long conversation grew up--and toward the close of that conversation, Mr. C. DID state that he felt it his duty to apprise me of the facts--and the understanding with me was, that it was under the idea that I might have thought of going there.

125

Soon after you first came to St. Charles, sometimes during your six weeks visit ( on the occasion of your visit to Mr. Thomas Lindsay, of which so much has been said,) Mrs. Ann G. Durfee says in her testimony before the Commission, "that she 'asked the accused how he supposed he would be supported here, when our church were unanimous in favor of the call of Mr. Gray, and could not raise more than four hundred dollars for his support?" The accused then said, that if he staid here some time, they would make up a good salary for him and say nothing more about Mr. Gray.

The leading facts on which this 2nd charge bears, seems to have been overlooked, or forgotten. The church and congregation of St. Charles having given an unanimous invitation to Mr. Gray, thre'their official organ, the Session, were yet waiting with much anxiety for his answer; when you appeared at St. Charles, and after a GOOD DEAL OF INDUSTROUS ELECTIONERING ON YOUR PART obtained from a few members ( entirely unsanctioned and objected to by many others, including the Session ) an invitation to stay and preach for the six weeks that it was expected would intervene before Mr. Gray could come. At the end of 5 weeks you went home to Franklin when and where Mr. Gray met you, and the conversation took place, which Mr. Gray details in his testimony.

126

Your culpability in this matter, consists in your interference to prevent Mr. Gray from accepting our invitation. This you did, Sir, by making false statements to him, which had the effect to raise doubts in his mind, as to the unanimity of the invitation given him; and even to make him believe that if he accepted the invitation he would certainly find himself in hote water here. The statements that you made to Mr. Gray, were in direct contradication to facts, and to the official assurance given to Mr. Gray by our Session. In all this you were using every influence you could exert to appropriate to yourself the field, to which you must have known Mr. G. had been most cordially invited without a single breath of opposition--whilst to yourself you well knew there was great and decided opposition, not of THREE or of TEN pr thirteen merely, but of upward of twenty besides the Session. Yet you allowed yourself to tell Mr. Gray, what he says upon his oath you DID tell him. The charge is not only NOT "trifling and unimportant," but in a character highly important in relation to, and in connection with the 5th charge. And tho' the words charged are not identically proven, the charge itself is substantially sustained, and is rendered strikingly important by the clear testimony of Mr. Gray.-- The Presbytery have said that the 2nd charge is not sustained. But the testimony says it IS--- And if it is sustained ( and I appeal to Mr. Gray's testimony to bear me out in the positive assertion that it is COMPLETELY PROVEN ) what I pray you is its irresistible bearing on the truth of the 5th charge; your disturbing the peace of this church. Not as an innocent OCCASIONER, but as the active, as the GUILTY CAUSE. You always attempt to evade the force of the testimony that supports this charge, and thus escape its overwhelming weight, by a desultory warfare against our church, in which you try to prove that it has always been notorious for its contentious disposition, and that disturbances therein are common. And you more than insinuate that the rigid severity and strict discipline of one of its ruling Elders has been the prime cause of all those dissensions-- And from this false premise ( proven to be false by your own witnesses ) you affect to argue that the PRESENT disturbance

127 is attributable to such causes; and not ~~at all~~ to YOUR intermeddling; and it would seem that you had contrived to persuade your Presbytery that such indeed must be the true state of the case-- Now, Sir, whatever may be the truth as to former dissention in this church, I do not mean to suffer any of your DEVICES to divert ME from the matter in hand, even if all be true, that you have so pertinaciously affected, but have not been able to prove, on this point you of all men living, ought to have kept away from St. Charles Church; as one the least likely to head division or to suppress strife. No matter how often it had been our misfortune or our sin, to "FALL OUT", that did not in the least excuse YOUR placing yourself in the very position to produce further discord. The true point of the argument is: WAS THE CHURCH IN PEACE AND HARMONY WHEN YOU CAME HERE IN JANUARY 1835?

128 You know that it was, entirely so-- that all were cordially united in Mr. Gray's call. Discord arose almost immediately on your arrival, on YOUR account, and you know it. You busied yourself endeavouring to form a union of the church around YOURSELF, utterly regardless of all decent courtesy toward Mr. Gray. You were candidly told by the Session that the church never COULD be united in you. Mr. Potts, who well knew all about us, wrote to you to that effect, and urged you to desist--long before your six weeks had expired; you witnessed the growing strife; and in your declaration to Mr. Durfee you THEN as good as avowed your purpose-- "THEY WILL MAKE UP A GOOD SALARY FOR ME, AND SAY NO MORE ABOUT MR. GRAY"-- meaning those you claimed as "your friends." And then soon after, in your conversation with Mr. Gray in Franklin, the whole tenor of your remarks proves beyond all cavil, that you had determined on your course, to "SUPPLANT" him, and PLANT yourself; reckless to all consequences to our church; and of all right feeling towards Mr. Gray. -- All this stands fully proven by the testimony I have transcribed from "The Record", and fully establishes the main fact, that your agency in "disturbing the peace of the church of St. Charles" was anything but a mere passive instrumentality, such as a "modest, retiring lady," or a "timid dear?" or a "purse of inanimate dollars."-- I am, therefore, authorized in the premises, to reiterate, and I DO reiterate the stubborn fact, that you, Hiram CHAMBERLAIN have been and still continue to be, knowingly and obstinately, not only the OCCASION but the CAUSE of "The disturbance of the peace of the church of St. Charles."

You say you are entirely satisfied with the terms of your escape from your trial before your Presbytery; and that your friends are also content. If you and they can EFFECT any consolation under the guise of an overstrained technicality, but it so. But I must still retain my opinion, that a careful examination of the testimony and CONSCIENTIOUS reflection upon it, will dissipate the delusion, that OCCASIONING and CAUSING are not synonymous in your case. And I shall here leave the matter for your more candid and mature consideration.

129 Your 5th proof ( paragraph 22 to 24 inclusive ) is an effort and a very inefficient one, to disprove my position that this church had not been disturbed in any SERIOUS degree for about eight years next preceding YOUR unfortunate advent among us. You refer to the testimony of Mr. Milton P. Cayce, and to a letter of Rev. Geo. C. Wood to Mr. Cayce, in order to show that the difficulty with Mr. Wood was a very serious affair; and to multiply words, you make quite a potter about the mistake I made as regards Mr. Watson's eldership ( already fully explained and answered in my note to you of 17th Feb'y.)

Now, Sir, I cannot discover any material difference between MY statement, and those of Mr. Cayce, Mr. Emmons, Mr. Jenkins, Mr. Gargin and several other witnesses. I say ( page 2 ) that the affair with and about Mr. Wood "produced some excited feeling in the church and congregation for a short time &c." There was certainly no serious disturbance, tho' as Mr. Emmons states, the difficulty that had arisen ( in which the congregation took by far the most active part ) was probability "APPROACHING TO SERIOUSNESS". I was myself, at that time, one of the congregation--a calm looker on-- cognizant of all the proceedings. I blamed Mr. Wood, and still do, for allowing himself to be so much irritated and misled. Every one loved him; and he left in peace and harmony. This took place about four years before you came. The difficulty, such as it was, was "Very soon subsided



entirely." and in the church left not a vestige worthy of notice. Mr. Cayce and a few others may have POUTED about the opposition of Mr. Lindsay and the old members; but I am very sure that no serious disturbance was ever the result. The election of a Pastor, especially if the congregation is allowed to participate in it, must always, with very rare exception indeed, be attended with more or less of excited feeling—but this does not necessarily result in any protracted strife and disturbance. In Mr. Woods case it certainly did not, altho' our Religious and Civil institutions are mainly based on the broad principle that "THE MAJORITY SHALL RULE". You are not ignorant, I presume, that experience has in many cases modified this general law, both in civil and religious concerns. And this modification is found essential in our Presbyterian Government, in regard to the Pastoral relation: FOR THE IMPORTANT PURPOSE OF PRESERVING PEACE AND HARMONY IN THE CHURCHES. And I believe it is an established maxim, that no majority, less than about four-fifths ought to force an unwelcome minister into a church, against the consent of the minority; and by parity or reasoning, no minister ever should allow himself to be thus obtruded. Such you very well know, Sir, is in effect, Presbyterian Law; and that it is moreover, sound-wholesome, and NECESSARY law. You whole tirade, therefore, about the rights of majority ( always assuming as you do, what never was true, that "your friends" are the majority ) is essentially REVOLUTIONARY in its tendency, and as you apply the doctrine, is subverse of law and order, in our churches-- Mr. Wood acted very differently.

You appear to have settled it in your mind; that if you can only establish the fact, that the "AFFAIR OF MR. WOOD" in the winter of 1830--did even "approach to seriousness" and amounted to a disturbance of the church's peace, that you are perfectly excusable, nay, that it is your rightful privilege to COME HERE, to BE HERE and to STAY HERE, as the innocent OCCASION of strife and disturbance in 1835, 1836, 1837 and 1838 &c.

131 Proof the 5th: Here you are at least inconsistent with yourself. Having taken upon yourself officially to counsel Mr. Gray with reference to the call presented to him from this church, to put him on his guard against too hasty a decision; it would seem to be particularly incumbent on you when devising your PROOFS, to provide one, at least, to meet the troublesome facts stated by me; that the call for Mr. Gray was perfectly unanimous and without even a breath of opposition, that your statement to him, in your interview at Franklin, were untrue, calculated to mislead and deceive him; and to disappoint the hope entertained by this church in getting him for its Pastor. But how have you succeeded, Rev. Sir? The witnesses, called by yourself, who testified on the subject of the call-- Dr. Graham, Elder Campbell, Dr. Wilson, Mr. Emmons, all ~~dis~~prove that it was unanimous. You quote a remark of Mr. Emmons, that "he became dissatisfied and retired," and another from Dr. Wilson, that HE THOUGHT some other besides Mr. Gray ought to have been nominated. And another from Mr. Wardlaw, Sen. that HE CONSIDERED the call as merely nominal-- All this you quote to confute the testimony of those same witnesses, at the same time, to the effect that the call WAS unanimous and without opposition, and that the meeting was called and held and conducted for the express and sole purpose of inviting Mr. Gray.

As I was present at that meeting, and was not an inattentive observer ( tho' not a voter ) I profess to be well acquainted with all the facts and details of the proceedings. Dr. Graham and myself happened to occupy a position ( on the Judge's bench--the meeting was in the court house ) which enabled us to hear and observe very distinctly all that was said and done. The meeting was a very full one, regularly organized, and very harmoniously conducted. On the announcement from the chair that the object of the meeting was to give a call to

132 the Rev. F. R. Gray to become Pastor of the First Presbyterian church with St. Charles; it elicited of course some enquiring as to the probability of being able to effect that object. Mr. H. H. Wardlaw stated the purpose of a letter that he had not long before rec'd from Mr. Gray, in which Mr. G. said he did not think he could come to St. Charles. This did for a time rather balk the proceedings: in no other respect, however, than to raise some doubts whether Mr. Gray could be prevailed on to come. It was determined, however, after consultation, to give the call at any rate; and by a unanimous vote, the Session was desired to prosecute the call accordingly. A subscription was then circulated through the meeting ( I have the very paper now before me, dated 2nd November, 1834 ) Whatever may have been the views of Mr. H. H. Wardlaw as to the character of the call, it was not then by him expressed. His subscription was the largest of any on the paper, and that of Mr. Alex. B. Campbell was also among the largest. The sum of \$235.50 was subscribed on the spot by 22 persons, 18 of whom were members of the church. Before the vote was taken on the call, Dr. Andrew Wilson did suggest the propriety of having some other nomination besides Mr. Gray; and it was at once whispered through the meeting that the Dr. was desirous, if the meeting would consent, to nominate you, tho' he did not mention any name. The Doctor's suggestion or motion, was refused to be considered even, by acclamation. Not one word in opposition to the call of Mr. Gray was uttered by Dr. Wilson or any other person. Whatever may have been his views and sentiments towards Mr. Gray or yourself or any other minister, the Dr. did not then in any manner express them. He was not a church member, and never I believe, claimed the right of voting on such occasions. His demeanor was gentlemanly and orderly. As I have had a long intimacy with Dr. W. I may here state that the fact was that he has always been considered "hard to please" in preachers and preaching. I remember, also, that Mr. Emmons did retire from the meeting before the vote was taken on the call. He was not a church member; nor did he take any part in the meeting or proceedings. He says he was dissatisfied; but no one can tell what about. He never expressed any dissent from the main object of the meeting; which he states to have been EXPRESSLY to call Mr. Gray; and says he "considered that it was their intention to invite Mr. Gray for a year." It is not only vain, but ridiculous in you Mr. Chamberlain to attempt to show that there was not perfect harmony at that meeting in the call of Mr. Gray, or that the call was merely nominal, not real: all your own witnesses prove what I have related.-- And as to your interference with Mr. Gray, I m utterly amazed at your denial of it--please to refresh your memory Sir, by reading what Mr. Gray has himself sworn to upon that point, and then deny it if you can, without some sharp twinges of conscience and blushes of shame.

133

134

Proof the 7th: Touching the resentation of the petition referred to by you, to the Elder Lindsay, Watson and Black, you quote me very unfairly. My language is, "For tho' no such petition was ever presented to THEM, SO THEY AVER," You omit the last three words, this making the assertion unqualifidly MINE, that "no such petition was ever presented to them." whereas I expressly place the truth of the fact stated, on the responsibility of the averment of those three Elders-- which averment, by the way, I believe to be true. Messrs. Lindsay and Watson have made oath before a Justice of Peace 25th April '36, "That a petition of that part of the members who have adhered to the Rev. H. Chamberlain to call a meeting of the congregation was never put into our hands, or presented to us as a Session, or as individuals. We had no regular notice that such a meeting was denied. We never refused to act as Ruling Elders in the church of St. Charles, but on the contrary did continue to exercise the function of the Eldership."

Mr. A. B. Campbell, when questioned by you before the Synod in October 1835, on this very point, gave no answer at all, as to PRESENTING the petition to those Elders. In his statement before the Missouri Presbytery in Nov. 1835 in reply to YOUR questions, he says "whic petition was presented to two of the Elders besides myself, and I have good reason to believe it was presented to Mr. Lindsay."

Dr. Graham also stated that "there was a petition presented to the Elders of the church." But he afterwards qualified the statement by saying, "I do not know personally that this petition was ever presented to the Session, but understood it was, and have reason to believe so." Now I chose to believe

the positive declaration of Messrs. Lindsay and Watson, in preference to the very vague and loose statements of Mr. Campbell and Dr. Graham; and think yet that I was correct. Certainly not censurable as much as I gave my authority for my statement.

135 Mr. Alex. B. Campbell tho' " a very honest and worthy brother, and an independent Christian freeman," is nevertheless quite as much influenced and liable to err, under party excitement as most other men. His position in relation to his brethren of the Session, was a peculiar one. He had undertaken a very bold and arduous enterprise, forcing you upon our church, in direct opposition to the other three Elders; and among other very strenuous exertions to carry his point, turned out to obtain subscriptions "for the support of a minister," not always explaining very clearly, WHAT minister, and in all his rounds studiously avoiding his brother Elders. And he also at the same time applied for signatures to the petition. At one house, he represented ( so the lady of that house told me ) that I had promised to subscribe twenty-five dollars toward the support of Mr. Chamberlain. It is possible that Mr. Campbell may have been told this--but it was totally untrue, and he never came near me with the subscription or the petitions either. I was, very reluctantly, forced to believe at the time, and do yet very firmly believe, that Mr. C. did use such means as I have described , page 6 & 7.

It is very true as you say, you had gone up to Franklin about the time Mr. Campbell was thus busied; but you had PREVIOUSLY done all you could to pave the way for his success, by visiting round among the families, particularly in the country, where you expected to be able to effect any favourable influence in behalf of your pretensions. And this, I repeat was "not strictly justifiable in the premises."

136 In paragraph 27 you have the effrontery to deny a part of Mr. Campbell's testimony quoted by me, in substance, page 8, 11; and at the same time charge me with preverting and trifling with Mr. C's oath to "suit a purpose," You say that no such testimony was ever given by Mr. Campbell in reference to the meeting of 22nd Feb'y '35, about which Mr. Emmons had testified--intimating that the testimony by me quoted was given by Campbell in referenceto some other election. What other election, Sir? there was but one other; that of 10th May for the election of Elders.

In your abundant charity ( or want of it? ) you can never allow me to commit a MISTAKE, without charging it upon me as a CRIME-- this is a very hazardous course, let me tell you, for one so liable as you are to "misrepresent plain matters of fact." I shall endeavour to avoid your example. When I read this 27th paragraph, I was, I confess, a little startled: hardly doubting that I had indeed made a mistake, howeverbeit, I had become somewhat familiar with your peculiar style of ARGUING. I supposed that you had of course consulted "the Record " and that I was at least convicted of error, if not of crime. To be sure of it, however, not feeling inclined to trust your candor too implicitly; I, too, had recourse to the DOCUMENTS: and lest you should still persist in your denial, I will here fairly and fully copy out from the minutes of the Synod and Missouri Presbytery, all that Mr. Campbell is therein recorded to have testified

137 as to those, ONLY two, elections--to wit that held in your behalf 22nd February 1835 ( referred to by Mr. Emmons" and that for your three new Elders 10 th May following.

It is proper to state here, that before putting the following questions to Mr. Campbell by Synod, the whole drift of the enquiry has been to ascertain from Mr. C. YOUR relative standing in the church and congregation of St.

Charles; as is very evident from the minister. Not a word had been said previously about the election of the Elders.

Near the close of Mr. Campbell's examination.

QUES: Bro. McAfee-- Do you know what proportion of the " members were present at the election?

ANS: A Majority.

QUES: Was there a majority of the whole church; i. e. those "in communion, WHO VOTED?

ANS: I think there was not.-- ( This is the testimony you say I have "inverted from its proper place.")

(After three other questions by Bro. Donnell, entirely irrelevant to this matter, except as to your relative standing. )

QUES: Bro. Lovejoy.--Did any but members vote at the "Election of the Elders?

ANS. Yes, a few. He then recalled this, and said "NO". ( This is all they asked about this election in all Mr. C's examination. )

QUES: (Immediately following the above ) "Did you say that all the difficulties grew out of Mr. C's coming there? Yes.

QUES:--Bro. Cochran--Did all who signed the subscription for a preacher vote for Mr. Chamberlain?

ANS: I think one or two did not." ( here ended Mr. Campbell's examination.)

"The witness acknowledges the foregoing his testimony.

Test: S. C. Mc Connell, Clk., p. t. "

I desire you to examine if the above is all correct.

138 On his examination before the Missouri Presbytery, Mr. Campbell was only asked THREE questions touching those two elections; at all relevant to my present enquiry.

"QUES: Was there a full meeting at the election of the New Elders?

ANS: There was.

"QUES: Was the vote unanimous? ANS. It was."

( And then intervenes a question about black members. )

"QUES: How many white members were favourable to my election at the time the election was held?

"ANS: Thirty-two or three." ( And he gives the names. )

In DIRECT, EXPRESS REFERENCE to the election of Elders, Mr. C. says the meeting was full ( meaning of course, his church ) and that the vote was unanimous--that is all voted.

When before Synod, in reference to SOME election, not definitely specified, Mr. C. says that the "proportion of the members present" was "A MAJORITY"--but he "THINKS" that a majority of all the members of the WHOLE church in communion did not vote. What did he mean by "WHOLE CHURCH?" He could not mean HIS church; if he did and had reference to the election of Elders, his answer here does not agree with his testimony before the Presbytery. If by "whole church" is meant all the members in communion in BOTH divisions ( which doubtless IS the meaning ) then the reference must have been to the election in February--because Mr. Campbell could not have spoken doubtfully saying " I think" if the enquiry had been as to the OTHER election ( to which no allusions had been made ) for he must have known POSITIVELY that notice of the members opposing Mr. Chamberlain

139 took any part in the election of the New Elders. A majority was present, he says, at the election Synod enquired about ( which ever that was ) but a majority did not vote. At the election of Elders, distinctly specified by Presbytery he says the vote was unanimous. Now if this witness supposed that the Synod and Presbytery both enquired of him about the election of the Elders, it appears manifested to my mind, that the answers are at variance with each other. But if Synod in their enquiry, had reference to the election of 22nd February, and Mr. G. so understood them; his answers are not inconsistent. In view of the whole tenor of the Synod's enquiry in their questions put to Mr. Campbell IMMEDIATELY PRECEDING those I have quoted, all evidently seeking information as to YOUR popularity in St. Charles; not a single allusion having been made to the election of elders previously to those quoted questions, I am perfectly sure, Sir, that Mr. Campbell's testimony on that occasion, was by himself understood to apply ONLY to the February election. And you cannot "wrest it" from that, to suit YOUR purpose, without a manifest violation of the truth, and trifling with Mr. Campbell's oath. A careful examination of "the Record" will, I am sure, convince you of what I say, tho' I am very far from expecting your acknowledgement of such conviction.

The declaration of Synod as to the presentation to Messrs. Lindsay, Watson, and Black of the petition to call a meeting, &c., was no doubt correct enough, as founded upon the evidence before them. ( Tho' I confess I do not find any such evidence recorded in the minutes of the proceedings ) Yet I must say  
 140 that the solemn declaration upon oath, of Messrs. Lindsay and Watson ( to which I have already refered ) has not only induced an "IMPRESSION" but a BELIEF in my mind, very different from the opinion of Synod. I cannot help noticing your very respectable deference to the decisions of our Church Indicators, whenever they seem to favour your views and purposes; as contrasted with your marked DISRESPECT and obstinate disregard of their judgments and advice when they conflict with your wilful inclinations.

Paragraph 28 treats of quite a variety of matters and things. Among them I am AGAIN belaboured for not testifying to facts entirely irrelevant, and concerning which I was not questioned. I might have given my "IMPRESSION" about majorities if you had asked me--but you took care to ask me no question that could lead to that subject. But I will NOW trouble you, without your asking; even voluntarily with a few statistical items touching your much boasted majorities; and shall draw my facts from the sworn testimony of your own witnesses, all duly recorded in the DOCUMENTS.

In the first place I refer to what Mr. Benjamin R. Wardlaw, swears ( the reader will turn to page 115 of this book ) Mr. W. was Secretary of the February election, please to bear in mind. He says that on that occasion the demonstration in your  
 141 favour was ABOUT 34 votes, including members of the church AND CONGREGATION. At that time there were 59 WHITE members belonging to the church, as shown by the Session Book. This statement of Mr. Secretary Wardlaw EXACTLY corroborates the statement made to you by your new Session, Wardlaw, Campbell and Cayce in their written communication ( on record ) of 11th May. I will here copy from that Document what refers to this point: "In accordance with the wishes of a majority of the church and congregation of St. Charles clearly indicated at a meeting held on Sabbath the 22nd Feb'y last by a vote of 34 members of said church and congregation; there being no opposing voice, but only a protest signed by three members of the Session and two of the Deacons." \*\*\*\*\* (See my notice of this in my narrative, Page 12, paragraph 7. ) Thus upon the best evidence ( double-official, it may be called ) the WHOLE vote in your favour, church members and OTHERS, is fixed at 34. I rely the more upon this, because the testimony

proceeds from Mr. Campbell, who called the meeting, and was exceedingly active and prominent in its proceedings. Mr. Cayce, who acted as Moderator, and Mr. Wardlaw as Secretary. Now if we know how many persons of the congregation, ( that is, those not church members ) voted, we should be able at once to fix upon the exact proportion of the church proper, that favoured your election--that some OTHERS did vote, is clearly proved and admitted by the testimony I have above related: but there is no direct evidence as to the precise number-- A little further patient investigation and analysis, will afford us some further light on this subject. In his testimony before the Missouri Presbytery, Mr. A. B. Campbell says that 62 persons in all, signed the petition to call the meeting for your election, 53 of whom were members of the church. When asked ( by Synod ) if all who had subscribed voted for you at that meeting, he ans. "I think one or two did not."--meaning, it is fair to infer, that all the rest DID vote for you. Thus it would appear that about 27 who were not members voted. If all the votes were counted, this would leave you only about 7 legitimate votes--this I do not insist on. All were not counted, of the congregation, who voted; otherwise there must have been 60 votes reported instead of 34. From all that I can learn from diligent inquiry, there were from 12 to 18 votes counted in the 34 not of ch. members. Say 12, which leaves 22 rightful votes only, ( 18 I still believe more correct but say 22 ) which is EIGHT less than a majority of the church.

This will appear more plainly true upon a little further investigation. Subsequently to the Feb'y. election as appears from the evidence in my possession, six if not seven of those MEMBERS who had voted for you on that occasion withdrew from you, and returned to the lawful Session; which, if 22 was the true number of your rightful votes at the election of Feb'y 22, would leave you only 15 or 16. Now if you will turn to Mr. Wardlaw's testimony ( p. 115 ) you will find him swearing that in Sept. 1835 ( he was then clk. of your Session ) there remained in your division of the church only "ABOUT FIFTEEN " of those members who had voted in your favour at that election. All this I take to be "INCONTROVERTIBLE PROOF" that your ELECTION was not sustained by over TWENTY THREE of the Fifty-nine members. Consequently THIRTY SIX members refused their assent. Say three fourths of the church, including three fourths of the session and two thirds of the deacons. It would be quite superfluous to pursue this point ( as to your election ) any farther: Mr. Wardlaw's examination took place early in September 1836, more than 18 months after that famous election. He now says he believes about 38 of "the present members of the church" ( your church of course is meant ) are favourable to you; but FOUR of those are very doubtful. ("One under consideration by Session" that adherence of two others disputed, and one living out of the bound of the church ) this leaves you 34. But 22 of these Mr. W. says are newly received members. (Since 10th May ) deducting there, you have remaining only 12 of the old members, or counting the 4 doubtful ones, SIXTEEN; all which you observe agrees with his other statements already quoted, within ONE. Mr. Wardlaw being clerk of your Session, speaks from "the record " no doubt. In November 1836, two months later still, Mr. Elder Campbell testifies before Missouri Presbytery that 32 or 33 members had favoured your election. ( which would leave 26 of the 59 opposed.) 5 he says, had left you and re-joined the old Session ( leave you 28 and the Session 31 ) 5 others he says had died or removed and joined another church. So that according to all this cyphering of Mr. Campbell, after more than TWENTY months proselyting of yourself and your ASSOCIATES--THIRTY ONE members of the old church, as it stood 22nd Feb'y. 1835, were with the lawful Elders and Session ( Lindsay, Watson and Black. ) and only TWENTY THREE of them adhering to your division of our distracted church. But for very obvious reasons, I prefer Mr. Wardlaw's more OFFICIAL version of this, by you, mistify'd subject. It is truly preposterous in you and your associates, with all this evidence actually before you; to pretend ever to have been elected or supported by a majority--"A LARGE MAJORITY" of the church of St. Charles. The reverse is true, as I have proved out of the mouth of your own witnesses. This investigation has

served to develop one other fact that you and your friends have sometimes ventured to deny. It is officially admitted by Elder Campbell, Moderator Cayce and Secretary Wardlaw, as managers of YOUR election, and also by them in character of Elders in Solemn Session, and so deliberately certified, subscribed and recorded; that at the said farce called your election; persons not church members DID VOTE, and their votes counted in your favour.

Mr. Emmons does indeed testify that the number of votes for you was not counted--but those other witnesses solemnly assert the contrary; and I cannot err in believing this testimony in preference. I now leave you to your reflection upon these points.

145 In your account of the election of Elders (10th May) you are singularly happy in casting darkness over that most unfortunate "SCHEME" of your associates with your concurrence and assistance. One would very naturally conclude from your statements, that the meeting for that unlawful object, was composed of a "FULL MEETING" of the church, both divisions, and that a majority of all the members were present, and voted for the Elders. The Synod declare that "it was in evidence that a majority of the church did NOT vote for the additional elders."

You again take the liberty of misquoting, in order to make out your case, First, by the OMISSION of some words, thus making me speak as of my own knowledge, when in fact I particularly found the assertions you quote, upon "other testimony" ( see page 12, p. 7 ) Is this fair, Rev. Sir? And again you misquote by ADDING some words., for the purpose of misapplying testimony. Thus YOU have "wrested from its proper place" by the addition of two words, that very identical portion of Mr. Alex. B. Campbell's testimony before Synod, that in your 27th paragraph you charge me with having perverted to make Mr. C. contradict Mr. Emmons. The question ( that you pretend to quote ) as it stands on the authenticated minutes of Synod, which I have already copied twice ( pages 114 and 137 ) read thus "DO YOU know what proportion of the members were present at the election?" --in order to make it "SUIT A PURPOSE" you add the words "OF ELDERS", so as to force its application to that election, where I have already demonstrated it does not belong ( See page 136 to 139 ) You appear to think yourself entitled to make use of the oath of Mr. Campbell, to bear you out in your attempt to "subvert plain matters of fact." and the better to cover your design, charge upon me the very same act that I have here so clearly convicted you of.

146 Your purpose in all this abortive effort manifestly is, to impose upon your readers the "IMPRESSION" at least, if not the BELIEF, that a majority of the whole Presbyterian church of St. Charles ( both divisions ) was in attendance at the election, of elders on the 10th May '35. And unanimously voted for the nominees. But the Synod concurred with the Presbytery of St. Charles upon a full hearing and annulled the election, and all the acts of the new Elders; your appointment specially included.

My words "little meeting" so offensive to you, were only intended to apply to the gathering so far as the meeting of church members, Many others I presume were present as lookers on, and in the aggregate it was what an indifferent person might very probably call " a full meeting".--My original statements ( pages 10 to 12 ) as to the meeting and its proceedings are fully sustained by indisputable evidence. Really, Sir, it seems to me very surprising that you should have ventured to agitate again those questions touching your two far famed elections. The first is proven to have been no election at all: nothing more than the assumption of a factious minority. And the other stands abrogated by authority: and I doubt not we shall shortly have that its abrogation has been fully confirmed by the General Assembly; to which Body you and your associates, merely to gain time, appealed about two years ago.

I expect to resume my notices of your pamphlet in a few days.

Yr. Obt. Svt.,

G. C. SIBLEY.

Lindenwood, 1st June 1838.

Rev. Sir: YOUR 8th PROOF contained in the 29th paragraph is designed to bolster up, by some show of argument and legal erudition ("Constitutional Law") the monstrous pretension that your appeal to the General Assembly from the sentence of the Synod of Missouri declaring the election of your three Elders "IRREGULAR AND VOID", arrested the force of the act; and authorises you and your Elders to continue in the exercise of authority you had assumed ( but annulled by Synod ) of Minister and Ruling Elders in and over the church of St. Charles, until the General Assembly shall order otherwise. In my note to you 24th January I have very fully discussed this whole subject, more particularly in reference to an assertion you make ( in this 29th Paragraph, near the end ) claiming the direct sanction of the General Assembly of '37 of your strange pretension. My remarks on this subject ( pages 19 & 21 of my narrative ) are the particular objects of your criticism. You claim to have arrested by your appeal, the whole force of Synod's sentence: and have based your claim on Constitutional Law. Let us examine this very curious argument of yours. The Synod adjudges that those Elders were irregularly appointed, and FOR THAT REASON annul--make void--vacate--nullify-- render of no validity or effect---abrogate--abolish (these are all synonymous terms used by Webster ) their election or appointment. The Constitutional Law of the Presbyterian Church, which the the ONLY LAW THAT we have now to do with, provides this: " if a sentence of suspension, or excommunication from church privileges, or OF DEPOSITION FROM OFFICE be the sentence appealed from, it shall be considered as in force until the appeal shall be issued."-- that is to say, such sentence shall be in force until otherwise ordered by the higher tribunal appealed to. This is the Law.

You admit that "the act of Synod was designed to annul the election." of those Elders--but insist that the Law cannot apply to the case, because the word DEPOSE is not used to express the design of Synod to DIVERT those irregularly appointed of their office ( tho' it WAS their intention as you admit, so to divert. ) and that, therefore, they might continue in the exercise of the interdicted office. You say that the technical word DEPOSE is only applied to the implication of CRIME--perhaps it may be so: and that may have been the reason why the Synod used a CORRELATIVE TERM to signify their intention of divesting the three "new Elders" of their office -- no crime having been imputed to them, further than is fairly to be implied from the adjudged fact, that they obtained their offices illegally. The illegality of the election is a settled point in the judgment of Synod ( and Presbytery ) which clearly places your "new Elders" precisely in the position they could have no more right to exercise the the office of Elders after the Synod's sentence of annulment, than they had before their election. they were in previously to the election.)

To DISCUSS such a proposition as you have set up is really no better than silly child's play. I can scarcely believe you serious in advancing as CONSTITUTIONAL LAW and common sense, so preposterous a doctrine as this 29th paragraph contained.

When, therefore, I say that you and your "new Elders" have placed yourselves "in an attitude very like defiance towards the law of the Presbyterian church," by continuing in the exercise of the offices from which the Synod of Missouri has by its solemn judgment DEBARED you--in effect DEPOSED you. I had only to appeal to the Law, and the facts and evidence, fully to sustain the truth of the assertion. TO DEPOSE means sometimes "TO DEGRADE"--sometimes "TO DIVERT OF OFFICE, without any degradation--depending always of course, upon the cause. In the case of your "new Elders", they were DEPOSED, divested of office for the specific cause of irregularity of their election; but there was no degradation-- Nothing like CRIME was charged against them. The necessary effect of deposition, is to deprive of office. And such also is the necessary effect of annulling the election under which office is claimed--in both cases the official relation is alike dissolved--in both the office-holder is debared the office, and has no right any longer to exercise its rights or authority. Even where ONE is deposed for irregularity in appointment merely



150 And ANOTHER for some criminal offence--they both stand on exact equality, in as far as their connection with office goes--they are both OUT OF OFFICE: and one has just as much legal right to continue action and authority as the other, and neither possesses any better right, than any one else, so long as the sentence of deprivation remains valid-- and its validity remains NECESSARILY, in law and common sense, until repealed by the proper authority.

For good cause a sentence of deprivation of office may be repealed, either by the tribunal pronouncing it, or upon appeal by a superior authority. In YOUR case, the General Assembly must decide--and until that supreme Indicatory shall so order, I maintain, Sir in the face of all your profound learning and logic: that the exercise by you and your new Elders of the offices of Minister and Ruling Elders in and over the church of St. Charles, is "an act of usurpation, and in violation of the settled law of the Presbyterian "church."

And this expression of my conviction does not prove me to be actuated by "party feeling" or by any other motive to mislead others, as you would have your readers to believe is the case. I trust Mr. Chamberlain, that I am incapable of groveling so low, as to identify myself in any sense in a PARTY CONTENTION with you. Tho' I shall continue without any disguise, to object against your unlawful proceedings towards the first Presbyterian church of St. Charles-- and if I think fit, to publish facts as they transpire in that connection. This I have done, and can do again, without any PARTY connection or any PARTY FEELING WHATEVER.

151 Your constitutional temperament of mind as it appears to me, renders it extremely difficult for you to keep the spirit of party out of your bosom whenever your views and interests happen to conflict sharply with those of others. You are then too apt to straightway erect yourself very consequentially into A PARTY: and judging your opponents, in opinion, by yourself, at once set them up as an ANTAGONISTIC party. Such is not my nature or disposition I assure you. "The Demon of Party Spirit" I am thankful to be able with truth to say has not obtained such dominion over my better feelings, as to beguile me into his narrow and crooked paths.--

152 Your NINTH and last proof, exhibits me before your readers, in the ungracious attitude of reviling "respectable and worthy citizens" for this purpose you quote from my 19th page. And here again you quote only partially: just enough FROM BOTH ENDS OF A SENTENCE to suit your purpose. What I have stated IN THE WHOLE SENTENCE, I still believe to be true, as to the violent anti-presbyterianism of some of the persons alluded to, and yet I think I may still regard them, as I certainly do, in other respects "respectable and worthy citizens" as the world goes. YOUR narrow party feelings and prejudices, would doubtless produce different "IMPRESSIONS" on YOUR mind. Whilst I sincerely pity you for this infirmity ( the natural progenitor of obstinate pugnacity ) I must decline being judged by your standard. You think fit, by way of illustration, to make allusion to a certain report made to Presbytery in 1835 by Messrs Lindsay, Black and Watson, Elders; and Jordan and Copes, Deacons, in which they say "that a party have called in unbelievers and SCOFFERS to vote down the church"--( I have not the document at hand, and adopt YOUR quotation ) This you have lugged in very evidently, to obtain grace in the sight of your supporters, out of the church. It is a sort of indirect denial of the statement you quote, as to its truth-- a kind of vindication of "THE CONGREGATION OF ST. CHARLES." A little piece of Jesuitism, to produce the impression, that YOU at least entertain too good an opinion of this community ( except those who oppose you ) to believe any of them to be SCOFFERS or to have been "called in" to vote down the church. This kind of electioneering demagogism, suits not, in my humble opinion, with your sacred vocation. Since you have dragged the matter up it may be out of place for me to inform you how the charge you have quoted from the report to our Presbytery, had its origin and upon what particular fact it was founded. Up to the time of

the "affair of Mr. Wood" and AT that time, many of those "who contributed to the support of the Gospel" in St. Charles, claimed the right of suffrage, in the election of Pastor and ministers for a stated supply, in the Presbyterian church; and the claim was at least tacitly allowed, tho' by some objected to as irregular and improper. It is within my perfect recollection, that at an excited meeting about the re-invitation of Mr. Wood, several individuals professedly anti-presbyterian--notoriously anti-christian--and at least, a Catholic by preference, took an immediate and active interest in the proceedings, for the avowed purpose of thwarting Mr. Lindsay, and for the mere "fun of the thing" to kick up a row in the church of St. Charles." Money was furnished to several persons, who might justly be called "unbelievers and SCOFFERS" that they might "contribute to the support of the Gospel," and thus entitle themselves to vote on the occasion--I do not believe, nor ever did, that either Mr. Wood or Mr. Cayce had any knowledge at the time, of this intermeddling, or but very few, if any of the members of the church: tho' the report DOES say as much as to charge SOME with having known it. Now whether any such attempt was made at YOUR pretended ELECTION in Feb'y 1835, at which persons not church members were allowed to vote for you; and to which allusion is made in the report referred to, I am not able to say. If such was the fact, the precedent in "Mr. Wood's affair" was probably used for some solous of justification or excuse. All such interferences of the "congregation of Saint Charles" in our Presbyterian elections, have been entirely discontinued and disallowed, since your famous election on the 22nd Feb'y 1835 by thirty four votes of the church and congregation."

Your occupy only six pages in setting forth your NINE PROOFS of the falsity of my narrative--of my recklessness of the truth, and your own immaculate purity. In my essay to vindicate my narrative, much more space than six or six times six pages has been required. At the conclusion of your specifications, you triumphantly ask your readers if you have not fully established the truth of your proposition, that my narrative ( History, as you call it in order to dub me the "HISTORIAN" ) is "utterly unworthy of his confidence."? The decision of this question, I am now perfectly willing Mr. Chamberlain to leave to your own conscience; but more so to the good sense and dandid judgment of your readers, even with no other lights than my narrative and your cross-examination, with my first two notes of 24th January and 17th February--I cannot and do not, expect, however, that very many of your readers, especially those who are strangers, to whom you address yourself more particularly, will ever see more of this controversy, that you IMPARTIALITY may allow; for as I have elsewhere told you, I shall not trouble myself to publish it.

You warn us all that you have yet in reserve many more PROOFS, but think the NINE you have presented quite enough and to spare, except for those refractory readers who cannot be satisfied with ANY thing from your pen. All such you confidently refer to that world where no doubts can exist: WHERE, as you would have us to believe, your NINE PROOFS will be found in the blaze of light and truth--MY conviction, I very much fear, must be postponed until those PROOFS are there illuminated

In the 32nd paragraph you take occasion to give vent to your spleen against my respected friends Watson and Lindsay, in terms that utterly defy comment. For a minister of the Gospel, ( of your pretensions ) deliberately to write and PUBLISH bitter inuendos in reference to the ruling Elders in the church, is to say the least of it, revolting to the feelings of every sincere follower of the blessed Redeemer.

The very conspicuous martial position that you assign me in the 33rd paragraph, proves you to be no less a Poet than Critic; and you have without scruple used the Poet's license of dealing exclusively in fiction. Your fancy sketch has not even the IMPERFECTION of being "FOUNDED ON FACTS".

If I understand the DRIFT of your 34th paragraph, it amounts to a general complaint to your readers that your opponents, THE MONORITY, do most cruelly and unjustly tyrannise over, and persecute you and your friends; altho' you and the

156 they constitute a large MAJORITY, denying you your rightful advantages and privileges of evidence,, appeal, etc., together, this paragraph is a curiosity in it way and the piteous complain therein set forth is not less curious. I can account for its ridiculous absurdity in no other rational, charitable way, than upon the conjecture that you were still soaring on your PEGASSUS, with your Poetarten's cap and wreath, yet encircling your brow. So far as I am in opposition to your course as a public man; I have already sufficiently "defined my position" and need not here say another word in that connection. And in reply to your charges against your other opponents in our church, I believe the language that I believed applicable when I wrote the 4th paragraph ( of the 23rd page ) of my narrative, still applies in all its force and meaning, not excepting the concluding clause. For the sentiment expressed ~~in~~ that clause, ( part of which your quote and comment on in your 35th paragraph ) I am wholly responsible; and tho' I sincerely deplore the still existing evil as therein described, and am by no means disposed to shrink from whatever share of the blame justly falls upon me; or to exonerate any others, who like me, may be classed in the unhappy category alluded to, from THEIR due share, yet I must remind you, Rev. Sir., that I describe the repulsive influence and feelings as affecting MUTUALLY the two PARTIES ( as you designate yourself and opponents ) You admit the existence of the evil in its full extent, but appear disposed to cast the whole reproach upon your opponents.--

157 Can you imagine Rev. Sir, that the harsh and vindictive language you have indulged in towards those who disapprove and oppose your views and pretensions have, in your several publications ( to say nothing of your wanton attacks upon me, or of your sayings and doings elsewhere ) could, in the very a nature of things, have any other tendency than to produce just that very MUTUAL feeling of estrangement and repulsion that actually exists, and that I have alluded to? Why, Sir, even whilst you were PENNING expression of pious sorrow and lamentation over this unhappy state of feeling in the church of St. Charles, YOU DIPPED YOUR PEN IN GALL, and used language infinitely more likely to perpetuate stirfe and disturbance, than to promote peace and concord. Under such circumstances, can you possibly entertain the slightest reasonable expectation, that your opponents will ever approach you with open arms and contrite spirits, and crouch to your cold and repulsive and haughty bearing? Surely not. If WE have thrown ONE barrier in the way YOU, Sir, have been the cause of MANY more. "First cast the beam out of thine own eye; and then shalt thou see clearly to cast out the mote out of thy brother's eye."

158 I have just learned, whilst closing my unpleasant and very irksome task of reviewing your pamphlet, that you are now absent at Philadelphia prosecuting your appeal from Synod, before the Gen'l Assembly now sitting; and that you are not expected to return to St. Charles for several weeks to come--this will afford me some excuse, if any be necessary, for some delay in making copies of this an my two last communications of the 7th and 28th for your use. Not a line of what I have written to you shall be seen by any other eye than your own until the whole of my review shall be fairly and fully before you. And I hope, Sir you will appreciate properly my motive for using this form of reply to your pamphlet, in preference to "A PRINTED BOOK". It has been adopted partly for my own convenience ( consulting my own perfect leisure ) but more especially with the view of laying before you in this quiet manner, my faull answers; in SOME hops that I might thus induce you to retract the numerous erros that I have been able "from the record" to point ou in your last publication.

If, in this review, I have been somewhat personal in some places, you must remember, Rev. Sir, that your own examples was before me, tho' by no means my model. A very bad example we must admit: and which I do not plead as any justification for myself, tho' alas for poor human nature! it may possibly serve ME ( tho' not you ) as some colour of palliation. And now, Rev. Sir, I gladly dismiss your "CROSS examination" and with not particular regret, take my final leave of YOU.

Yr. Mo. Obt. Svt.,

GEO. C. SIBLEY?

159

Having now finally disposed of Mr. Chamberlain's pamphlet in the SIX preceding communications addressed to him direct; I intend at my leisure, to record such other facts, and events, having a general relation and connection with Mr. Chamberlain's instrumentality in the disturbance of the First Presbyterian Church of St. Charles. In overhauling the large mass of records, documents, &c., in my possession, to enable me with the more precision to answer the Rev. Gentlemen's Nine "INCONTROVERTIBLE PROOFS"; some interesting circumstances have been developed, not before adverted to; which serve to illustrate still more completely, not only the peculiar genius of Mr. Chamberlain, but also as I think, the PRIME object of his pursuit since May 1835.

In pursuing the principal purpose of my "REVIEW" ( the vindication of the TRUTH of my narrative of 1837 ) I found it out of my power, wholly to abstain from personalities, consistently with the fact, that I was also repelling, what seemed to me the main object of Mr. C's publication, a systematic personal attack upon me; which was certainly not warranted by anything that I had ever published, written or spoken concerning him; even concerning his public ministerial career and character. But I am free to confess, that I am not of those who believe that the clerical Robe ought always to shield its wearer from wholesome scrutiny: for I am persuaded by some experience, that it sometimes "covereth a multitude of sins."-- June 1838.

Geo. C. Sibley.

160

NARRATIVE CONTINUED FROM Lst. JUNE 1838.

On the 23rd May '38, the Gen'l Assembly disposed of Mr. Chamberlain's appeal, by the following act; as certified by the clerk: Rev. John M. Krebs:--

"In the case of an appeal of certain persons claiming to be THE CHURCH OF "ST. CHARLES, against the Synod of Missouri, it was Resolved: That the General Assembly sustain the appeal PRO FORMA; and orders the entire setting "aside of all the proceedings in the whole case, in all its stages, from the "time that the first notice was given to call a meeting of the congregation "for the election of the three Elders; and directs all the parties to stand "precisely where they did before any step was taken in it."--

161 Mr. Chamberlain and Mr. Lindsay were both in attendence on the Assembly when this act passed the first, of course, persecuting his appeal--Mr. Walter H. Lourie ( a member ) had been appointed to defend the Synod--a good deal of discussion took place before the decisive vote was taken. Mr. Chamberlain was, as usual, amply provided with many Documents, &c., and was allowed the full scope for his oratorical powers--As the case was docketed, he was claiming for himself and associates, and DID so claim, to be "Minister and Ruling Elders of the church of St. Charles," from and after the 10th day of May, 1835, when the three new Elders were elected. To obtain the sanction of the Gen'l Assembly to this claim, was a very important object with Mr. C. ( as will very clearly appear presently ) and he strove for it with all his powers. Success in this, would at once, by the Same Act, set aside necessarily the old Session, Lindsay, Watson and Black, and THEIR adherents of the old "First Presbyterian Church of St. Charles." ( for whom Mr. Chamberlain explicitly demanded in his appeal, a separate, NEW organisation, to be of course designated by a new name. ) and set up Mr. C. and HIS adherents in their stead, as the First Pre. Ch."etc . --- this matter will be again adverted to presently. The Resolution adopted by the Assembly, as herein recited, was drawn up and offered by the Rev. Rob't I. Breckenridge, who had opposed Mr. Chamberlain in all his whole project,. The Resolution it will soon

be seen, directs both parties to resume the position they respectively occupied on the 25th April, 1835: which by a common sense, common English, matter of fact interpretation, as applied to the Rev. Hiram Chamberlain -- Benjamin R. Wardlaw, Pleasant Cayce, and William Spencer, forbids them any longer to arrogate to themselves any official authority in or over the church of St. Charles; inasmuch as neither of them pretended to possess any such authority on or before the said 26th day of April '35. And being this DISROBED by the highest authority, for the reason, as the Synod of Missouri decided ( whose judgments the Assembly clearly intended to affirm ) that the manner in which those would be dignataries had EN ROBED themselves was unlawful. And further, this Act of Assembly, whilst it strips the above named "PERSONS CLAIMING TO BE THE CHURCH OF ST. CHARLES" of the offices they had assumed, carries with it the very obvious interdiction from any future assumption

162 of the same, without the assent of the constituted authorities in conformity with the law and practise of the Presbyterian church. Such was surely the meaning of Mr. Breckenridge who drew up the Resolution ( as he declares in a letter of the 2nd July '38, now before me. ) and such was the purpose of the Assembly in passing the resolution from Mr. B's hands after his full explanation of its intended purpose. The candid reader will doubtless consider Mr. Chamberlain's controversy with the organization of 1818 " to be the church of St. Charles," finally settled by the above decision, and that he would now desist from all further pursuit of that object: and content himself with having himself and adherents organised as a new church. But not so. Tho' he had exhausted all his right of appeal, from Session to Presbytery, Presbytery to Synod, Synod to General Assembly, resulting in one uniform denial of his preposterous claims; occupying three years in their prosecution all that time unlawfully holding on to the prohibited offices, this unhappy man now determined to brave and defy all authority; not even excepting that of reason and common sense. On his return to St. Charles from his attendance on the Gen'l Assembly, Mr. Chamberlain actually had the effrontery to assert that the Gen'l Assembly did in their late act ( above recited ) intend to reverse the decision of the Presbytery of St. Charles and Synod of Missouri, in

163 sustaining his appeal PRO FORMA and that he and his people consequently were virtually ~~at~~ recognized, allowed to be, and by authority of the said act set up and established, as the church of St. Charles, that is to say THE FIRST PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH OF ST. CHARLES. This Mr. C. proclaimed from his pulpit, and published otherwise, to be the true and AUTHORISED construction of the Assembly's act. And he and his party immediately assumed all the corresponding powers, rights, privileges and claims ( as far as they were able ) tho' not without some serious doubts and misgivings on the part of several of his associates which were subsequently more unequivocally manifested. The admission of the above arrogant and absurd interpretation, must necessarily have involved the following consequences: First To confer upon Mr. Chamberlain and his party the LEGAL SUCCESSION to all the rights, claims, etc., held by the "opposition party" under the original organization of 1818. SECOND, To denounce "the three dissenting Elders" ( as Mr. C. calls Messrs. Lindsay, Watson and Black in his appeal ) together with their adherents of the church as " a dissenting party,"--as schismatics-- So to be considered and treated--AS SUCH TO BE SUBJECT TO DISCIPLINE UNDER MR. C. AND HIS SESSION; and thus "by the strong arm of the ecclesiastical law" "brought back" to a proper sense of duty, and repent of "THEIR GREAT ERROR." in opposing Mr. Chamberlain and Mr. Campbell and their "LARGE MAJORITY". These are consequences that would have

164 attached LEGALLY to the Assembly's Act according to Mr. Chamberlain's ASSUMED construction. The reader will the more clearly see this, by reference to Mr. C's appeal to the Gen'l Assembly. (Reasons" 9.12.15 ) appended to this volume--which appeal he virtually claimed to have sustained in whole and in part ON ITS MERITS; and not merely PRO FORMA as it is written in the act--refer also

my narrative, pages 18 and 19, which will supersede any further remarks here, upon the import and tendency and DESIGN of Mr. C's bold pretensions ( in his appeal ) PROVIDED it were possible for ANY tribunal even to admit them. The manner in which this infatuated man pursued his new visionary scheme, and the manner in which the "opposition party" proceeded in reference to his new and lofty pretensions, are fully set forth in the following petition to the Gen'l Assembly asking for an Act explanatory of the meaning of the Assembly's Act of May 1838. I will first copy a few lines from Rev. R. I. Breckenridge's letter, before referred to, of 2nd July 1838.

"The action of the Assembly in the case of your troubles at St. Charles, WAS VERY EXPRESS: and I am deeply grieved to learn that you are likely to have more war there. I am thoroughly convinced that Mr. Chamberlain can never get any candid body of men, whether Presbytery or Synod or Assembly, to uphold him in  
165. "being EVEN THE OCCASION, must less the cause of trouble in a Presbytery to which he does not belong, and which has required him to cease acting in its bounds, and in a church which he found at peace; and of which a very large and respectable minority, of not a majority, are and always have been opposed to him. Such I believe, was the almost unanimous feeling and opinion of the last assembly. And my only surprise was, that he should be willing to commence another three years contention, with the full assurance, that he will find himself at the end, no nigher to success that at the end of his first controversy."--

Doubtless it occurred to Mr. B. as wholly unaccountable, rationally, as it had to many much nearer to the field, why Mr. Chamberlain should be so doggedly bent on setting himself and associates up as the church of St. Charles. Why not content himself with a separate and NEW organization, ( which no one would have opposed or objected to a moment )? Why insist on ousting the old organization--dissolving and outlawing it; and appropriating to himself and party its original NAME? Why so ardently and so obstinately, and unfairly contend for more than three years; to displace  
166 his opponents and establish the right LEGABLY, to be their successors? I shall endeavour, in due course, to answer all such questions, and to solve the apparent mystery that dictates them.-----The Petition.

"To the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church  
"in the United States of American.

"Dearly Beloved Brethern- -

"The undersigned, who are the elders and deacons of  
"the First Presbyterian Church of St. Charles in the State of Missouri; for themselves, and in behalf of the other members and communicants of said church, hereby  
"approach your Reverend Body as humble petitioners; induced thereto by the peculiar  
"nature of their present condition; a solemn sense of duty and the common desire of self preservation.  
"It is of record in the archives of the General Assembly that early in April 1835,  
"A memorial and complaint was sent up from the Ruling Elders and Deacons of this  
"church, to the Presbytery of St. Charles, setting forth that Rev. Hiram Chamberlain  
"of the Presbytery of Missouri was here occasioning and causing very great confusion  
"and disturbance in the bosom of our ( previously to his coming ) peaceful and  
"harmonious church. That the Presbytery at a Special Session in June, and at their  
167 "regular stated Session early in October 1835 took order on the said complaint  
"and after due enquiry and deliberation, required the said Chamberlain to  
"cease his ministrations here, and "to retire from the troubled region". And also  
"annuled the appointed of three new Elders who had been irregularly and unlawfully  
"elected unde the auspices of said Chamberlain, on the Second Sabbath in May,  
"agreeably to certain unauthorised notice given out ( under the same auspices ) on  
"the 26th day of April 1835. That the said Chamberlain and his coadjutors appealed  
"from these acts of the Presbytery to the Synod of Missouri; which body at their  
"annual Session in October 1835; after a very careful and full investigation of  
"the whole subject ( the Rev. Chamberlain being present with his witnesses, documents etc., ) so far confirmed the judgments of the Presbytery as to declare the  
"election of the three Elders, null and void, and all their acts as such ( including

the proceedings had in inviting Mr. Chamberlain ) irregular; and concurred also with the Presbytery in advising said Chamberlain to seek another field than St. Charles. That the said Chamberlain and his coadjutors, then immediately appealed from the judgment of the Synod, to the General Assembly of 1836, which appeal having been post poned at the Session of 1836 and 1837 was taken up by the Gen'l Assembly of 1838, and disposed of by the passage of the following act:

168 "Resolved: that the General Assembly hereby sustains the appeal PRO FORMA, and orders the entire setting aside of all the proceedings in the case, in all its stages, from the time that the notice was first given to call a meeting of the congregation for the election of the three Elders, and directs the parties to stand precisely where they did before any step was taken in it."

"When the petitioners received the official intelligence of the above act; they did not for one moment doubt the intention of the General Assembly to be, to annul all the proceedings in the whole case in all its stages that had taken place subsequently to the 28th day of April 1835 ( when the notice was first given to call a meeting of the congregation for the election of the three Elders ) and to place the parties, as nearly as was practicable, in their respective positions at that date. Or in other words, to re-open the case, if unhappily it should be found necessary, before the Presbytery of St. Charles, upon the original complaint of the Elders and Deacons, still on file there, which bears date of April 2nd 1835. Four petitioners in common with other members of this church, believe that the INTENDED effect of the General Assembly's Act above quoted was virtually

169 "to confirm the judgment of the Synod of Missouri so far as to annul the election of the three Elders, and all their acts purporting to be the acts of the Session of the church of St. Charles, including the proceedings had, in inviting Mr. Chamberlain; and to forbid by necessary influence, a repetition of the said irregular and unlawful election, and other proceedings in that connection. And they are unable to put any other reasonable construction upon that act. - - - And yet the said Hiram Chamberlain immediately after his return from his attendance on the Gen'l Assembly IN THIS CASE in June 1838, did proclaim to his adherents, and publish to the whole church; that the rightful and INTENDED effect of the said Act of the assembly was to justify and sustain him and his coadjutors in all their proceedings here, and to establish THEM over the Church of St. Charles, as our lawful Minister and Session. And he has without ceasing, and without any concurrence with your petitioners, and a large majority of the members of this church, continued to act himself, and to persuade a few others also to act, in the wildest spirit of those pretensions: affecting to consider your petitioners and friends in this church, as a SCHISMATIC, DISFRANCHISED and EXSCINDED FACTION. And openly

170 "denouncing them, in his new-born zeal, as NEW SCHOOLITES--ABOLITIONISTS, and COLD WATER DRINKERS. The ruling Elders of this church, notified the Presbytery of St. Charles of the facts in relation to the extraordinary course pursued by Mr. Chamberlain; in a written communication forwarded by their delegate Mr. Watson, and by him laid before that body, at their Session in October 1838. In their communication the attention of the Presbytery was called to the Act of the General Assembly of 1838, and to the evil effects justly to be feared from the strange course of Mr. Chamberlain--referred to them to the memorial and complaint ( on file in their archives ) of April 2nd 1835, sent up from this church; and earnestly invoked the protection of Presbytery, and their prompt action in our behalf. But in consequence of the division and separation that took place in the Presbytery; and the failure to constitute a Synod ever since; nothing has yet been done in compliance with our just and reasonable expectations. But the newly constituted Presbytery of St. Charles ( into which Mr. Chamberlain was unlawfully admitted as a member ) has passed some acts in relation to this church, substantially adopting and sustaining Mr. Chamberlain's construction of the Assembly's Act herein referred to; and virtually outlawing and disfranchising our petitioners, with a large majority

171 "of this church; and that took without any notice or hearing.

"Thus has the said Chamberlain been permitted by the authority of a Presbytery claiming jurisdiction over it, TO CONSUMMATE ONE OF THE MOST FLAGRANT AND HIGH HANDED WRONGS UPON THIS CHURCH, EVER RECORDED IN THE ANNALS OF THE PRES-



"BYTTERIAN CHURCH. Its object and tendency, if not asserted, is nothing less than to pull down the lawfully constituted and organised presbyterian church of "St. Charles. which is thoroughly sound in the faith; resolute in support of all "the principals, standards, doctrines, rights and privileges and duties of "Presbyterianism: And on its ruins to set up the said Hiram Chamberlain and a "small minority of our members ( including only one of the six lawful officers, "and THAT one residing for two years part out of bounds. ) the most of whom "attached themselves to Mr. Chamberlain in support of NEW SCHOOL principles, "and in opposition to those by which your petitioners and friends are known "to be governed. - - - - Your petitioners are aware that they cannot bring their  
 172 "grievances before your Rev'd Body as appellants; and they do not approach you now "in that character. They believe, however, that it is competetn and lawful for "them to ask the General Assembly to pass an act explaining of the act of the "assembly of 1838, herein refered to and recited. And this your petitioners for "themselves and their church respectfully and earnestly pray your Reverend Body "to do.

"And as in duty bound, we will ever pray."

Signed--Thomas Lindsay, Sen)  
 Sam'l S. Watson ) Elders  
 N. B. Barron )  
 E. H. Jordan )  
 Tho. P. Copes ) Deacons

St. Charles, Missouri, May the 4th, 1840.

The Rev. I. L. Yantis ( delegate from the Missouri Presbytery ) was the bearer of the foregoing petition to the General Assembly; by whom it was also presented ~~tax~~ and its object earnestly advocated. And the matter was duly notified and attended ~~yo~~ to by the Assembly agreeably to the usual forms of proceeding in that Body. On the 1st of June the subject was taken up, and the following minutes adopted by the unanimous consent of the General Assembly.

173 Extract from the minutes of the General Assembly:

"Monday morning, June 1st, 1840. The committee to whom was refered overture No. 3 "difficulties in the church of St. Charles" made report of a minute, which ~~was~~ "adopted.  
 "First.-Resolved: that this Gen'l Assembly understand the act of the Assembly og 1838 "as sustaining the appeal of Rev. Hiram Chamberlain, NOT UPON THE MERITS OF THE "CASE, but on account of informality in the courts below. And that in " THE "ENTIRE SETTING ASIDE OF ALL THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE CASE,--they intended not only "to annul the part, but also to forbid all subsequent action aontrary to the will "of the regularly constituted authorities of that church. And they hereby "declare any such unconstitutaaanal action that may have been since had, by any "person or persons in connection with that church to be NULL & VOID."

The above final decision of the General Assembly effectually thwarted all Mr. Chamberlain's ddep hid and long cherished SCHEMES, by annulling all the pro-ceedings of himself and associates, had since the 25th day of April 1835, and including also the action of the Presbytery of St. Charles, complained of in the  
 174 Petition of the Elders and Deacons etc. - - And at once restored or rather confirm-  
 ed the "constituted authorities of the first Presbyterian Church of St. Charles" to and in, all their rights, privileges and immunities previously enjoyed; against the pretensions and persevering efforts of Mr. Chamberlain and coadjutors of every

class during the preceding period of five years. But it did not by any means subdue that unhappy spirit of **oppugnancy** for which Mr. C. has always been so remarkable; and which was so **signally manifested** during the whole period of his most unwelcome sojourn in St. Charles. His further contumacy tho' frequently exhibited, was entirely impotent however, and only resulted finally in the **dissolution** of his association, and HIS departure from St. Charles which latter event occurred early in the year 1844.

175 In order to complete our History from 10 May 1835 so far as Mr. Chamberlain had any connection with it, it will now be proper to return to that point of time, and from thence trace the proceedings of that gentleman and his **PRIME COADJUTORS** in special reference to the main object of their pursuit-- that object I believe I may safely aver to have been, **THE POSSESSION OF OUR HOUSE OF WORSHIP AND THE LOT OF GROUND UPON WHICH IT STANDS.** This proposition I will now undertake to prove.

176 If the reader will take the trouble to recall to mind how **unceasingly** and **obstinately** Mr. Chamberlain and his party have, from the organisation of their new Session claimed to be **THE church of St. Charles:** the facts that I am about to state will at once explain the reasons, for what must have appeared a very strange course of conduct on the part of that association. For they might at any time have obtained, without opposition, from the competent authority, a new organisation as a separate church, if they had asked it: and they **WOULD** have asked this, I must believe, if their real and only object has been, as they so constantly held out, to enjoy **peaceably** and properly those Christian, and church, and Presbyterian privileges to which they were indisputably entitled; and for which they said all the while, they were contending. It was all the while very plain however, that their purpose could not have been simply a **peaceful separation** from the old Session, and the old church: in order to associate themselves as a new one. They would have it that Mr. Campbell and the members who followed him ( nearly every one of whom, Mr. Campbell included, were comparatively new members. ) were rightfully **THE** church: and that Messrs. Lindsay, Watson and Black, the other three Elders, and those members who preferred to remain where they wer, rather than follow after Mr. Campbell, were a "dissident party" and no longer a church at all. Their doctrine was, that the **THREE** Elders had left the **ONE**; and the whole effort appears to have been to make this out so that Mr. Campbell and his three new associated Elders ( irregularly and unlawfully elected 10th May 1835 ) might with some plausibility cleaim to be the **SUCCESSORS** of Messrs. Lindsay, Watson & Black, Etc. This position they boldly took and in all their proceedings ( appeals, declarations, publications &c. ) they constantly struggled to maintain it, with Mr. Chamberlain in their front, their oracle, adviser and dictator--refer to the appeal to the Gen'l Assembly ( See page 25 ) ( from the pen of Mr. C. ) and there observe the haughty tone and language toward the old Session, the avowal to superceda them,-- to pursue their bold career, without designing "to enquire what had become of those" whom they in their plentitude hadm by a miserable fiction, summarily set aside. If the candid reader will consider all these facts, and farily weigh them, he must be irresistibly led to the conclusion I am sure; that a mere separation, lawful and peaceful, **COULD NOT** have been the prime motive for Mr. Chamberlain's five years war upon the oldestablished Presbyterian church od St. Charles. He and his adherents mighteasily, at first, have formed a bond of union in the Gospel, if such had been their desire; without disturbing the old church from which many of them had broken off; and without being themselves disturbed: and there is good reason to believe that the greater portion of them would have been happy to adopt that plain and Christian course. But Mr. C. and his new Session had from the first committed themselves to the bold policy of setting themselves up as the **SUCCESSORS** of "the dissident party", as they denominated all those of the church,

177

who refused assent to their silly pretensions. But why thus obstinately contend for the name and succession? Was it because Mr. C. Imagined his honour and character at stake, as he once intimated? Surely THAT was not rational excuse. Shall we ascribe to him then the obstinacy of mere pride? the empty vanity of victory? the idle childish whim for a mere name? Was her under any obligation as a Christian minister, to insist on this vexing the old Session and their friends; in disregarding the advice of HIS friends, or of Presbytery and Synod and the direction of the Gen'l Assembly? Why not let the old Session and the old church enjoy their old name and designation in peace, and take to themselves some other? But no, no, he could not be content it seems under any other coy-nomination that that of "1st. Presb'y Ch. of St. Charles" which alas! already belonged to "the opposition party," by right of Baptism, and which they had borne for upwards or twenty years. The whole secret of Mr. Chamberlain's extraordinary pertinacity assuredly lies in this, reader, and looks very like what is sometimes called a YANKEE TRICK.

The name so ardently COVETED, possesses a legal right and title to "a certain lot of ground situated in the town of St. Charles," upon which stands a snug brick church that cost about \$4,200 (NOT OVER \$50 OF WHICH WAS CONTRIBUTED BY MR. CHAMBERLAIN'S FOLLOWERS AND ADHERENTS ) Attempts were made at three different times, by Mr. C. and party, to obtain possession of this property, BY RIGHT OF SUCCESSION; and by force of an arbitrary legal construction, unrighteously to wrest it from the rightful owners, and appropriate it to themselves. Now have patience, reader, and note carefully the following details, which will be found abundantly to substantiate all that I have promised.

179 FIRST: On the 9th January 1833, the board of Trustees of the town of St. Charles made an ordinance, granting a certain lot of ground ( the same above alluded to ) in fee simple "To the Elders and Deacons of the Presbyterian church of St. Charles, AND THEIR SUCCESSORS IN OFFICE." please note that the Elders and Deacons were not named in the ordinance.

SECOND: On the 26th February 1835, the Board of Trustees, by their chairman, John Silly, Jun., executed a deed in conformity with the ordinance of 9th January 1833 transferring thereby said lot in fee simple to "Thomas Lindsay, Sam'l Watson-James H. Black-Alex. B. Campbell, Thos. P. Copes, Elisha H. Jordan and Robert Spencer, Elders and Deacons of the Presbyterian church, AND THEIR SUCCESSORS IN OFFICE." , which deed was acknowledged in due legal form on the 2nd March '35 before Benjamin Emmons, Justice of the Peace, ( and is now of record in the proper place, in Book K. page 190 ) and placed in Mr. Tho. Lindsay's hands.

THIRD : Said deed was neglected to be recorded for more than a year after its execution and delivery: and was moreover mislaid by Mr. Lindsay--forgotten--and supposed to be irrecoverably lost, until about the first of April 1835, when it was accidentally ( providentially ? ) found in some out-of-the-way file of old papers; on the 4th April, it was duly filed for record, and on the 7th duly recorded--and is now in my possession.

180 FOURTH : Whilst the Said deed was thus hidden, and not to be found, tho' very diligently searched for; the circumstance became very publically known, and was much spoken of, in St. Charles. By many, and even by Mr. Emmons, it was doubted if any such deed had ever been made at all: at any rate it was given up on all hands, that no such instrument then existed; and application was made, or was known to be intended, for a new one.

FIFTH : At this very time, in March 1836, Mr. Chamberlain and his coadjutors had become unusually imperious and VORACIOUS in their old pursuit. They were making their appeal to the General Assembly of '35 against the recent judgment of Synod. The appeal in all its dimensions had been freely and exultingly strewn around, ( it was soon after -( April 14th)- published at large in the Saint Louis Observer )

its argumentation pointed out as irresistible and perfectly conclusive, as to the RIGHT of Mr. C. & friends, to be THE Church; and a church persecuted and wronged. Just at this time, reader, when Mr. C. seemed to all to be borne on the popular breeze, the question arose about a new deed; and another question arose as to whom it rightfully belonged? THE ORDINANCE NAMED NO PERSON AS ELDERS & DEACONS; and 181 it was held; and admitted by the THEN board of trustees, that if THEY were to make a new deed, as in conformity with the ordinance, they should feel themselves free to insert such names as "Elders & Deacons", as to THEM might appear best entitled at the time they should make it; and they did not conceal their opinion that Mr. Campbell and the three new Elders under Mr. Chamberlain's ministry were the persons so entitled. Mr. Chamberlain and his co-adjutors did not fail to avail themselves of these circumstances to secure the property. They, therefore, claimed, and asked for the deed as rightfully and legally falling to them by SUCCESSION. And accordingly the deed was made--whether it was ever acknowledged, delivered and recorded or not; I am not certain: but think it was. Certain it is, however, that it was thus claimed, and was either fully completed, or in the process of completion, when the original conveyance was brought to light again.

If it was on record on the 4th April ( the day the old deed was filed by me for record ) its priority of record could not avail the new claimants. I quickly convinced them, and the makers of their deed; that the circumstances attending its execution were of such a character, and were so well known, that any open advances to claim the property under its sanction; would be attended inevitably with certain legal penal consequences, not very pleasant, or very profitable to those concerned in 182 it and thus ended the first open GRAB at our church property. Had the old deed been actually lost, as there was no record of its ever having been executed ( unless there was some note of it on the journal of the trustees ) I do not see how Mr. Chamberlain and his associates, could have been foiled in their purpose--certainly not without much trouble and expense. The immediate surrender of the property would have been demanded most assuredly.

SIXTH: At this time, the church building was in considerable forwardness--about ONE THOUSAND DOLLARS had been expended on it; not FIFTY OF WHICH WERE CONTRIBUTED BY MR. CHAMBERLAIN'S ADHERENTS TO THE CHURCH.

SEVENTH: This property was thus saved from Mr. C's grasp thro' the Trustees of St. Charles, THEIR powers over it was exhausted--and Mr. Chamberlain and friends were not yet prepared to set up any LEGAL claim, as being THE church of St. Charles. As yet the Old Session and friends maintained that title, and were recognized as such, by the competent lawful authority. But Mr. Chamberlain still held on resolutely to his pretensions.

It will be asked, by what authority I implicate Mr. Chamberlain in these transaction? It is true, he has disavowed all concert, or even previous knowledge of the schemes of his party-- But he has on so many occasions identified himself 183 decidedly and most conspicuously WITH them, and as their leader, that I feel fully warranted, not only in recognizing him in that character: but in considering him as justly chargeable with, and responsible for, all the prominent acts of his party. The reader will be fully satisfied on this point, when I come to relate the THIRD attempt of Mr. C. upon our church property in 1841.

The SECOND attempt was made on the 7th January 1839 in the following official form; I copy from the original:

"Messrs. Thomas Lindsay, Sam'l Watson, E. H. Jordan, & I. P. Copes, FORMERLY Elders and Deacons of the Presbyterian church of St. Charles, and now in possession of the church property on the hill-- Gentlemen--having been appointed a committee of the Presbyterian church of this place, to wait upon you for the purpose of ascertaining the terms upon which you will SURRENDER TO US said church property, or the sum which you will agree to pay and keep it in your possession. We the said committee hereby submit the subject to your consideration. Respectfully request a written statement of your terms by the 13th inst. as our board of trustees will meet on the 15th to take into consideration your propositions."

"Signed- Henry Bangs )  
Stephen Spencer) Committee

Dated 7th Jan'y 1839

- 184 The foregoing document is indorsed, "NO NOTICE WHATSOEVER WAS EVER TAKEN OF THIS COMMUNICATION." and so that matter was dropped-- It was probably intended only as a FEELER--but it proves that the object was not yet abandoned. When this very polite demand was made, Mr. Chamberlain, was still acting upon his wild construction of the Gen'l Assembly's Act of 1838, and had been greatly encouraged by some proceedings in favour of him in the Presbytery of St. Charles. He was, therefore, indulging very high hopes, and according to his nature, was prone to exhibit rather an arrogant spirit. It would be quite preposterous to suppose for a moment, that the "committee of the Presbyterian church" Messrs. Bangs and Spencer, had received their appointment, and made their communication, without the knowledge and concurrence of Mr. Chamberlain--the object was too important, too deeply interesting to him, to have been attempted without his privacy and approbation. If he did not project the thing himself ( which seems most probably ) he certainly did not oppose it, or object to it: for if he had, the DEMONSTRATION would not have been made. It is scarcely worth the while to make any further comment on this rather ludicrous transaction. Subsequently to the final action of the General Assembly upon Mr. Chamberlain's appeal. ( 1st June 1840 ) an act of organization was obtained from the proper authority, to organize Mr. C. and his adherents as a separate church, in St. Charles; which was accordingly done in due form, at the Court House, under the direction of Rev. A. Bullard, the minister who had been deputed for that purpose. This organization took place in the autumn of 1840.
- 185

- But when in course of the formal proceedings the moment came for the BAPTISM of the infant church, and the officiating minister enquired for the NAME by which it was to be designated and put upon the proper register; behold Mr. Chamberlain, who stood as sponsor, declined to furnish any name, HINTING however, that the family intended at some future time, to adopt an appropriate and favorite cognomination for themselves. Mr. Bullard did not like this irregular mode of procedure, and suggested several names, either of which he thought might answer well enough; but Mr. Chamberlain was obstinate; and the business was finished, and Mr. B. departed, leaving the newly organized church without any BAPTISMAL name or designation. And this the matter remained, until the Synod of Missouri met at St. Charles ( 14th Oct. 1841 ) Mr. Chamberlain now made personal application to Synod when in full Session, to have his church, by that body, baptized by the name of, and formally recognized as "THE FIRST PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH OF STL CHARLES." I happened to be present in the church, as a looker-on, when this extraordinary movement was made, and earnestly, ( I may say desperately ) passed by Mr. C. I saw at once his aim, and felt apprehensive that he might effect it, unless promptly met and opposed. I immediately spoke to Mr. H. R. Gamble, a member, who was very near me, and desired him to explain to the Synod, that the name Mr. Chamberlain was so much in love with, already belonged to another church. ( whose house of worship they were sitting in. ) by which they were regularly baptized twenty three years ago by the Rev. Salmon Giddings; and that the old church had particular reasons for preferring to retain her old name, and VERY SPECIAL REASONS for declining to give it up to Mr. Chamberlain and his new church. Mr. Gamble chose a proper moment, to advise the Synod of those facts; which he very fully stated, and pretty plainly hinted at the effect that MIGHT follow the compliance of Synod with the demand of Mr. Chamberlain. Mr. Lindsay, also interposed, having come in whilst Mr. Gamble was addressing the Synod, and certified the facts, &c.
- 186
- 187

The Synod of course refused Mr. Chamberlain's demand, and that gentleman retired in very ill humour. He had now played his last trump ( to use the Gambler's phrase ) not entirely inappropriate by the way ) and had finally lost the desperate game that he for six years been manoeuvring to win. Could he have obtained the Synod's fiat for assuming the name and title of the "1st pres. Ch. of St. Chr." his next step would have been to proclaim a complete triumph, to exult in the APPARANCE at least, of having after all, accomplished, without the assent of the

188 Gen'l Assembly, his project of disfranchising his opponents ( the legitimate church ) obliging them to seek a new organization, a new NAME, AND A NEW HOUSE OF WORSHIP-- whilst he and his coadjutors would formally and authoritatively assume to be the old church, BY SUCCESSION and BAPTISM; and in due time proceed to demand, at the point of the law, possession of the church property. Can there be any reason, reader, to doubt, that such would have been substantially the results of Mr. Chamberlain's success in his schemes, as I have thus briefly related, and I believe fully proved and illustrated them? If I HAVE acquitted myself of my promise, to set forth the true object of Mr. C's pursuit, to wit, our church property: I ask the candid reader how he would characterize his conduct in the premises? If we consider the nature and value of the things COVETED, to say nothing of the act of COVETING itself, forbidden as it is in the Decalogue, that Mr. C. and his party were willing, nay nextremely anxious to seize upon and appropriate to their own use; a property worth from FOUR TO FIVE THOUSAND DOLLARS, all paid for, but about fifty dollars of it, by money and labour of those they thus sought to despoil: If we observe this man, an authorised minister of the Gospel, standing on this very property, on the floor of the church, in an assemblage of his brethern there convened; and demanding THEIR sanction to an act designed COVERTLY to enable him to consummate this ROBBERY. If these things are seriously considered, scanned and weighed... But I turn from the disgusting picture and here drop the curtain.

\* \* \* \* \*

189 The following "Exhibit" was published shortly after the demand was made for a surrender of the church property thor' Messrs. Bangs and Spencer, committee &c. ( see page 183 ) Altho' no official notice was ever taken of the demand, the fact of its having been made, was no secret: it was pretty generally known, and supposed to have been predicated on the fact that Mr. Chamberlain's division of the church had contributed largely towards building the church: and some quite lofty pretensions were set up on this hypothesis, claiming at least a MOIETY of the cost of the Building.

190 In order at once to put this matter right, I determined to publish a complete detailed statement of the names of the actual contributors, with the sums subscribed AND PAID, by them respectively. This I caused to be done in the "CLARION" a weekly paper published in St. Charles by Nath. Patton, from which I have cut the subjoined "EXHIBIT" It is a perfectly plain and TRUE statement, from which the "Intelligent public" very soon informed themselves as to the fact "WHO BUILT THE CHURCH" and also very nearly, about what it cost to build it. This statement has never been questioned as to its accuracy, except in one instance. Mr. High H. Wardlaw took great offence at that part of the article in which is noted THE FACT of his having abstracted one thousand feet of pine plank from the church materials: and by way of set off, published a very INTEMPERATE and abusive attack on me, in printed handbills ( Mr. Patton refused to admit it in his paper ) All this ( handbill & all ) has some connection, as I conceive, with the "Chamberlain disturbance", because Mr. Wardlaw, as is well known, was next to Mr. Chamberlain, a prime leader, and most zealous partisan, and promoter of the disturbance in our church. And I have therefore appended to the Exhibit, a printed copy of Mr. Wardlaw's handbill: followed by the correspondence that grew out of it between Mr. W. and myself; together with some subsequent inquiries, discoveries and explanations touching the subject. necessary to place the matter before the reader in its true and proper light.

Mr. H. H. Wardlaw originally subscribed \$75 towards building the church. But he never paid but \$20 IN ANY WAY whatever.---- Miss Tabitha Fulton, a sister of Mr. Wardlaw, subscribed \$100 --- \$50 of which she paid in advance. She died before the other \$50 was called for, and the Administrator of the Estate, Mr. Ben. R. Wardlaw, refused premtorially to pay or to recognize the church's claim, tho' the estate was abundantly able to pay it.---the claim was properly presented but not pressed--the refusal to pay it, evidently proceeded from PARTY motives.

## E X H I B I T

In relation to the Building and furnishing of the PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH, on the Hill in the town of St. Charles. The whole amount subscribed from first to last, in money, materials and labour, is \$ 4, 1 3 7. 8 3, the whole amount paid on these subscriptions, is \$ 2, 9 6 2. 33. The amount contributed in donations is \$374.--- The sums actually received from all sources are shown in the following detail:2

FROM WHOM RECEIVED	AMOUNT \$ cts.
Pleasant Cayce	8 00
Benjamin Emmons, Sen.	1 00
Robert Spencer	5 00
Alexander B. Campbell	5 00
Robert A. Cummins *	18 00
John T. Long †	20 00
Catharine Long *	5 00
Sarah Long *	5 00
Hugh H. Wardlaw	20 00
Sarah H. Wardlaw	4 50
Benjamin R. Wardlaw	15 00
	<hr/>
	\$106 50

Note: The \$39.50 paid by Mr. Wardlaw and family was entirely withdrawn and \$5.00 over, in 1000 feet of Plank taken by Mr. W. from the church; to replace which, I had to pay Wm. Eckert \$45

	45 00
	<hr/>
	61 50
William M. Campbell	22 50
John W. Redmon *	5 00
Andrew Wilson	45 00
Tabitha Fulton	50 00
Amy Garvine and Son	31 00
Rebekah Koonts	25 00
Jane A. Robinson and Sons	15 00
Leo Twyman	10 00
James H. Black	7 50
R. Preston of Dardenne,	12 00
L. Howell & Mr. Alexander do	4 95
L. Jane Millington	1 00
Walter Phillips	5 00
M. Kelly \$2, S. Taylor \$3	5 00
Charles C. Machatt	9 00
James Machatt	5 00
Mary Machatt	2 00
Eliza Hartford	2 00
Ebenez'r and E. D. Ayres	10 00
Daniel Griffith	5 00
Sinai \$10, Nelly \$1 ( col'd women )	11 00
T. Brunell *	1 00
Henry Mc Kenny	2 50

Mary and Matth's Watson	12 00
Sam'l Watson	100 00
Thomas P. Copes	359 00
Elisha H. Jordan	72 00
George C. Sibley	859 57
Mary E. Sibley	20 00
James Morrison	15 00
Nathaniel Patton	20 00
Thomas Lindsay, Sen'r.	647 00
Rev. J. H. Fielding	10 00
Rev. James Gallaher	100 00
Robert Boal	104 00
Archib'd Gamble, of St. Louis	100 00
Charlotte Lindsay	5 00
Agnes Lindsay	5 00
Isabella Lindaay	5 00
James Lindsay, Jr.	5 00
Thomas Lindsay, Jr.	16 00
James Lindsay, Senrio	10 00
Ann G. Durfee	5 50
Margaret Graham	2 50
Ann C. Russell	5 00
Mrs. Parmer	2 00
Mrs. C. Ritchey	2 00
Phillip A. Stocklager	5 00
L. E. Powell	10 00
Mr. Tuttle \$5, Mr. Orndofffe 3	8 90
Mr. Shapard 3, P. Grace 1,	4 00
T. Jefferson Robbins	5 00
G. Lurton	5 00
John Orrick	5 00
Alexander T. Douglas-	5 00
John Boggs 5, J. H. Dennis 5,	10 00
W. B. Ferguson	5 00
T. Boal	5 00
Z. Harmon	5 00
C. Pascoe	2 00
John Naylor, of Dardenne	16 00
J. Moore 5, D. Preston 1,	6 00
Mr. Gould 1, B. Orrick 5, *	6 00
Samuël C. Mc Cluer	2 00
M. Grater 2, E. Forsee 8 *,	10 00
Jacob White, J. B. Muschaney	10 00
W. N. Fulkerson 2, R. Boal 5,	7 00
Dr. W. Briscoe	5 00
Donation from Columbia in South Caroline, by Mrs. Robanson	229 00
Donation from St. Louis, in money, \$35. Paint, Oil, &c \$58	93 00
The drapery, carpet, lamps, &c, for the pulpit, furnished by the Ladies, and valued at . . . . .	52 00
Received on Subscriptions	2,962 33
Other contributions	374 00
Whole amount received	

---

\$3,336 33

Those marked \* were not paid in money.

GEORGE C. SIBLEY  
Treas. & Agent.

January 12, 1839



192 Here follows Mr. H. H. Wardlaw's Handbill.

Addressed-- T O T H E P U B L I C

In the Clarion of the 10th instant, a column is filled with what professes to be an "Exhibit in relation to the building and furnishing of the Presbyterian Church on the Hill, in the town of St. Charles." and over the signature of George C. Sibley, styled Treasurer and Agent.

As I am somewhat becoming familiar with EXHIBITS from that quarter, I could have met this with perfect composure, had the TREASURER AND AGENT permitted us to have passed quietly in the crowd, but he taken pains to surround myself and family, and a few other respectable individuals, with black lines and annotations, and make an emphatic pause for calculation.

Being the subject of such MARKED attention, I conceive it to be my duty and privilege, to EXHIBIT a few additional items, and to contradict, promptly and positively, such parts of the EXHIBITION relating to myself and family as may be false.

Had all the facts connected with the subject been EXHIBITED I would not complain, but the SPECTACLES were screwed and unscrewed to give LIGHT and SHADE to the representation, as might best suit the purpose of the EXHIBITOR himself. And what the purpose of this exhibit was, we are not informed, and can only venture to conjecture, that its object was two fold; first to EXHIBIT the extraordinary ability and liberality of Maj. G. C. Sibley himself, in giving, with his family, \$212. 57 cents more than any other person, and although he is his own reporter in the case, yet who dare doubt an entry from his official pen; second to present this, with like instances of liberality, in HORRIBLE contrast, against that expunged remnant of our congregation, that his pen has separated from their associates in crime, and stricken entirely from the Journals of Ecclesiastical and civil society, with a forlorn state of only \$61.50 left; and thus bring down the indignation of an intelligent Public on the devoted heads of that presumptuous Congregation that had the arrogance to appoint Trustees, and who in discharge of their delegated duties appointed a committee to wait upon the quondam officers of the Church for the purpose of peaceably negotiating certain rights, supposed to be held in that Church property, when according to the Agents clear and explicit showing, we have but \$61 and 50 cents invested, and scarcely that.

We get credit for \$20,15 & 4 50, which makes \$39 50 this subtracted from \$45 leave 5 50, the amount of our defalcation. I do not regret, that I am defaulter in no larger amount, but it is a subject of mortification to our pride that the amount is so small;--we are not permitted to take rank with our contemporaries on that list.

I will now attempt to give something in the shape of facts from memory alone, asking to be excused if I should miss the hour, the minute, of the day, when an important event transpired, or if, I should overlook a few feet of Pine Plank in my haste to file the plea of NON EST FACTUM, not having in my possession, or access to, at present, a single paper, relating to the subject. ~~Saxatix~~

193

Sometime in the latter part of the year 1832, and early in the year 1833 a subscription was taken up to build a Presbyterian Church on the hill in St. Charles; my subscription at that time was greater than Major Sibley's, and as much as that of any other individual with one exception. The whole church and congregation were at that time united in this object, a plan was digested and in the summer of 1833, the Brick work was let, Brick was purchased and the Carpenter's work was also let, so far as the enclosing of the house, and a certain raft of Pine Plank was purchased at \$2 00, or \$2 25; the building progressed slowly that summer and part of the next, until the Brick was exhausted, and the work stopped, when from 6 to 8 ft. of wall was built, and a certain proportion of Carpernters work done and the building then remained for two years in STATU QUO. In the meantime the church divided and never afterwards met on that subject.

Mr. Thomas Lindsay, Senr. was the original Treasurer chosen by the Church, and Maj. G. C. Sibley and Benj. R. Wardlaw, were appointed a building committ, and afterwards on some matter of difference arising, Wm. M. Campbell was elected and added, soon afterwards Maj. Sibley resigned and thus ended his official connection with the church, so far as recognized by the Original Church and congregation of St. Charles, the portion of the church separating from us, disregarding all former arrangements, plans and appointments, did arbitrarily, again commence and finish the building, without asking or permitting us to participate in any other way than by paying our subscriptions, and the first intimation I had of Maj. Sibley's roll of official church digity, was the first and second application to pay the ballance of my subscription, which I refused except on certain conditions---and since I have heard nothing further from the subject, and never before, since the transaction, has the Plank case been mentioned to me, and in fact, I had almost forgotten the circumstance. I now face the charge directly of withdrawing and taking away 1000 ft. of Plank, and must take the liberty here of requiring Maj. Sibley to produce his proof.

I am not charged directly with dishonesty in this transaction, but he makes the inference as strong as he can make it in words, and no doubt wishes this impression to be left without further explanation.

When the answer to all this ostentatious malevolence is simply this: In the summer of '33 we needed a small quantity of Pink Plank at the Steam Saw Mill, to make a drum wheel nine feet in diameter; the plank was no where else to be had in the place, my son Benjamin spoke to Mr. Cummins, who had the oversight of this Plank, to buy as much as would be necessary for that purpose. Mr. Cummins told him he was not authorised to sell, but it was agreed that he should take the plank, and return them in kind, or give the amount in other lumber at the Mill.

The Plank was got, measured and account preserved, and I was fully of the impression long since settled, as there was every opportunity for that purpose, for at the very time the plank was got, the Church had Bills for Lumber at the Mill to a considerable amount, and have gotten lumber thro' the whole progress of building, and I am sure that if the plank had not been settled they would have had the inclination and opportunity at sundry times for the past three or four years to have settled it. And from previous specimens of their forbearance we are more than astonished that this subject has never been mentioned until now.

Major Sibley knew and now knows as well as he knows any other truth, that the plank was got in '33, long before the separation in the church, and was never intended no is yet intended to have any reference to the subscription.

194

The next specimen of that christian charity that rejoiceth no in iniquity but rejoiceth in the truth is in his estimate of quantity, and here we expect to show that Major Sibley's statements as usual are unfortunately somewhat at variance WITH THE TRUTH, I do assert and can prove when Benjamin returns by written and oral testimony that we did not get the one half of 1000 feet of church plank, and I can now prove from the circumstances of the case and the data on which Major Sibley bases his calculation, that his exhibit is neither true in fact or by inference. Mr. Cummins says that the plank lay exposed, from the spring until the winter following, when he sold it, and from the measurements which at it was first received, and the measurement at which it sold shrinking and all, there was a loss of something near 1000 feet, and during the time it lay exposed, he frequently missed plank and on one occasion he missed a considerable quantity and saw the track of a cart leading to the country. Now it is just as probable that Major Sibley was withdrawing some of his high swelled amount of subscription, as us, for at that time he certainly needed that article more than we did. Another specimen of Major Sibley's honourable feeling and veracious exhibition and I am done. He says " to replace which I had to pay Wm. Eckert \$45 00 now it is well known the lot of plank first bought for the church was very indifferent and unfit for fine work, and although afterward the article rose in price, yet Major Sibley did during the time the church was last in progress, buy plank from Mr. Chauvin at \$3.75 per hd. and at the time he made the purchase from Mr. Eckert ( as he states ) at 4 50 per hd., the same gentleman had plank equal to

to the first plank bought at \$4 00; but the plank alluded to was selected for the purpose of making pews and placed, as it is stated, to my account. Now I would like to see the rule by which Major Sibley makes his calculations and ascertain by what process and computation he can demonstrate my liability for more per hundred feet than Mr. Cummins sold the balance of said church plank for per hd. which was \$2 50: that amount I am prepared to settle ( if not already settled ) whenever the quantity is ascertained and avoiding for the future if possible all depredations upon Church Boards, and withdrawing myself from all matters and things, connected with this church dinary, and bind myself in all future time to leave him unmolested, if he will only do me the same favour. I am unpractised in newspaper discussion, and have neither time nor inclination for such employment, in this respect the Major has greatly the advantage, it is therefore with extreme reluctance I enter the lists with such a veteran, and ask it as a special favor that hereafter his geometrical skill may be applied to subjects of more importance and utility.

I can meet an honorable friend or an honorable enemy without embarrassment, but I must confess I have yet to learn how to meet such rare productions as this prolific pen gives birth to, and I hope hereafter when it gets in labour, I may be SPARED from its bringing forth for my benefit.

H. H. WARDLAW.

JANUARY 23d 1839. -----

Note: I never in the least noticed the publication of friends Wardlaw's, any further than by the note I addressed to him on the 28th Jan'y ( copy of which with Mr. W. answer is annexed. ) Mr. W. notwithstanding his disclaimer was rather fond of controversy, & very apt, -from his unfortunate habits to be violent & intemperate in his language. I had no claim to dispute with him: & determined not to do it---\*\*\*\*

195 Upon my reading Mr. Wardlaw's abusive hand-bill several days after its publication, I addressed him the following note.

Lindenwood, January 28, 1839.

Mr. H. H. Wardlaw:

Sir:-- The enclosed copy of a note that I have just sent to Mr. Cummins, will inform you why I charged you with a thousand feet of plank in the "Exhibit" that I thought it proper for me to publish in the Clarion lately. Mr. Cummins' statement, as I have quoted it, I would have no hesitation to SWEAR, if required, is precisely what he informed me in relation to the plank in question: and I have no reason to doubt that he fully believed in its accuracy at the time he made it. nor have I ever doubted it 'till your late denial.

I was informed that the plank you took was of the very best quality, as none else would have answered the purpose for which you used it: which authorised me, as I conceived, to price it at the same rate that I had to pay for other plank of the same quality, called for to make seats in the church by Mr. Taggart the Carpenter.

196 I assure you, sir, there was no design on my part to classify you individually, the list of names contained in my statement; and I am at a loss to perceive how you can suppose so. If it was proper for me to deduct the value of the plank abstracted by you from the amount of receipts, it was obviously most proper to do it where your name occurred, in order to present the facts together, in their natural order and connection. I am the more surprised that you should SCOLD so vehemently about this, as you acknowledge your regret and even mortification, that no LARGER deduction is justly chargeable. It is customary to publish

\*\*\*\* Mr. W & I had always been on friendly terms; and I always found him a good neighbor. G. C. S.

such exhibits; and in the present instance, I am sure it is right and proper, if not highly necessary. I took great pains to make my statements correct; holding myself ready to rectify all errors therein, when pointed out to me in a proper manner.-- Whatever mistake there may be in relation to the plank, either as to the quantity or quality, might very easily have been corrected, without the trouble and expense you have incurred: and altho' I am insensible to the unjust and entirely unprovoked ABUSE that you have indulged in towards me, and so wantonly exposed in your HAND BILL: I feel no scruple or hesitancy to tender you my word of promise, to acknowledge, and promptly refrain any and every wrong that I may ever have done you; whenever you put it in my power to do so, consistently with truth and honour; and I now call upon you to do this, without any unnecessary delay: and I shall expect your compliance. Do not misapprehend me--I do not intend to allow myself to be PITTED before the public, in a controversy with you. The QUARREL that you have so needlessly tried to provoke with me, I will take no share in. I owe you no grudge, wish you no evil, feel towards you no unkindness. All that I desire, in the premises, is a fit and IMMEDIATE opportunity to prove to you, that if I HAVE wronged you, I am ready to make you amends: to convince you that I never DESIGNED to injure you--and that as I am utterly unable, at present, to perceive any just cause, or reasonable pretence for it: I AM RESOLVED NOT TO QUARREL WITH YOU.

Yr. Obt. Svt.,

GEO. C. SIBLEY.

\* \* \*

198 The note to Mr. Cummins, Vis:

Winden Wood, Jan'y 28, 1839.

Mr. Cummins- Sir-- Mr. Wardlaw, as you may have seen, disputes the accuracy of my statement lately published in the Clarion, as to his having abstracted so much as a thousand feet of pink plank from the church, &c.; and as my statement in that particular was made in entire reliance upon yours to me, about a year ago, I have to request the favor of you to take some convenient opportunity, to explain the matter to Mr. Wardlaw, who I am sorry has seen fit to make a violent public clamour on the subject, without any effort to obtain the explanation from me as to the alleged error in my statement; which explanation, I would most readily have given; and promptly have corrected any mistake, &c. You will remember, that on the 25th January 1838, when we had our final settlement of the church account, you gave me a statement of the disposition of the lot of planks that you had in charge, formerly belonging to the church. That statement is as follows:

"January 25th, 1838, Mr. Cummins states about the planks; that in the spring of 1834 Mr. Copes took 200 feet, and also 370 ft for which part he has his receipt--that the Messrs Wardlaw took a quantity away without measuring, or leaving him any satisfactory account of it, he thinks they took AT LEAST A THOUSAND FEET--and thinks there was 1,000 ft. more stolen."

I copy the above from the original statement as I wrote it down from your lips, and I as think, read it to you. I asked it of you, as I told you, by the desire of those for whom I was acting. If you have any reason to suppose that your statement was erroneous as to Mr. Wardlaw, have the goodness to inform me.

Yr. Obt. Svt.,

GEO. C. SIBLEY.

## Mr. Wardlaw's Answer

Union Bluff, January 30th, 1839.

Maj. G. C. Sibley:

Sir: Yours of the 28th only reached me this evening, and is now before me; and without allowing myself to indulge in any unnecessary replication to some remarks in your note, permit me to assure you, that I most cordially reciprocate those conciliatory sentiments expres'd by you; for with sincerity I can repeat your language, "I owe you no grudge--wish you no evil, feel towards you no unkindness." And I am prepared at any moment to give the opportunity for explanation you desire; either here, at your own house, or at the house of Mr. Cummins, or any other place that will be most convenient. And I further remark, that if I have done you an injustice in the HASTY production that was published, I will always be found ready, in due time, to make the necessary reparation--but I must now correct an impression "that I have needlessly try'd to provoke controversy," by saying that nothing is more against my habits and wishes, than strife. Peace, sweet peace, with me, is a pearl of great price, and I have still endeavoured to remember the value ( Note A. )

I may have used, and frankly confess that I DID use, intemperate remarks; and by way of justification, I say now, come let us reason together.

You must admit, that the language of your note in the exhibit, imply'd our improper taking away of that over which I could have had no control, without the voluntary surrender by the persons having countrol, and as no intimations were given of such surrender, consequently the inference of fraud ( Note B. ) Again, I did consider it an insult for any person to suppose for a moment, that I was capable of the meanness of withdrawing that which had already been contributed for my own personal benefit ( Note C. ) But I must not say more. I will only further reply to the expression of your readiness to have corrected any errors in relation to quantity, quality and now as the statement you allege to have been made by Cummins was vague and indefinite at best, and as you must certainly have known would have been to our prejudice, especially with strangers, presented to public view in the manner in which it was done; I will ask you candidly as a neighbor, if it was not your duty to have given me information of the claims first, its amount, &c.? which you knew was available at law, so far as the quantity could be proved ( Note D ) And I further have to state, that so far as I was informed, disinterested strangers, who was without our sensitive church atmosphere, view'd the note as a direct impeachment of integrity, and requiring prompt explanation. Benjamin has either in an old book, or on file, the whole amt. which can hereafter be had.

I have no disposition to dispute the statement you make as coming from Cummins a year ago. But the statement as from him in the Hand Bill, is his statement now literally-- Since your note to him I have not seen him.

Respectfully,

H. H. WARDLAW.

202 Note A.: Mr. Wardlaw's handbill affords a striking commentary on this delcaration. When restrained by his better feelings, my good neighbor, was I truly believe, a lover of "sweet peace"; but when under the influence of "strong drink", also! too frequently the case, his temper became offensively pugnacious and was wont to break out in the written forms. All who knew him well, knew how to appreciate his missles.

Note B. : The fact is, it was hardly possible to have made this statement in any less offensive form to Mr. W. and at the same time to convey the proper information to the public. If there is any blame attaching, it is more to the stubborn facts themselves, than to the manner of setting them forth--a circumstance that Mr. W. does not appear to have considered. The NOTE is exactly TRUE as far as it goes--BUT DOES NOT CHARGE PLANK ENOUGH.

Note C. : And yet, Mr. W. expresses his mortification, in his handbill that the abstraction was so small.

Note D. : Mr. Cummins made his report to me 25th Jan'y '38. My exhibit was published 19th Jan'y '39. And the plank had been taken at least 3 years before THAT. So that Mr. W. had at least THREE years in which, either to have returned, or p'd for it--it was very supposeable that HE knew the quantity. As to the PRICE, THAT mattered not. Mr. W. was clearly bound to make good what he took.

I never imputed to Mr. W. anything more than negligence in the affair. No uncommon fault of his.

203 In pursuance of Mr. Wardlaw's proposal to meet me at Mr. Cummins's for explanation, &c. We had an interview there for that purpose on Friday morning, the 8th of Feb'y; and in presence of Cummins had a long conversation, which was conducted throughout, with perfect frankness and good nature. Mr. Wardlaw admitted freely, that the QUALITY of the plank taken was of the very best, that NONE BUT the very best could have answered his purpose; and he also admitted, that he could not obtain anywhere else at the time, suitable plank; and that the whole quantity required by Stuart, the Carpenter who made his TWO mills wheels, was taken from the church plank.

But as to the QUANTITY Mr. W. was not able to say precisely what it was, nor on this point could he and Cummins agree. Mr. W. promised however to ascertain all about it as soon as his son Benjamin got home, and settle the affair satisfactorily. And I on my part promised, publically to correct any error contained in the exhibit touching this matter, whenever it was properly shewn to me.

Happening not long after this conference with Wardlaw and Cummins, to meet Mr. John H. Stuart, at Mr. Lindsay's and learning from him that he made Mr. Wardlaw's TWO wheels ( he said he made TWO) and that he recollected very distinctly the dimensions of the wheels, and that they had been made WHOLLY of plank obtained from the church; I handed him a slate pencil, that was lying on the desk near, and requested him to make calculation of the QUANTITY necessary to make the two wheels. Mr. Stuart said that none but what the carpenters call "Clear Stuff" and wide plank would at all answer for such work, and that in cutting it out into circular pieces, there was necessarily much waste and....&c.

204 The result of OUR cyphering ( for Mr. Lindsay and I also took part in it) was, that to make the two wheels, NOT LESS THAN THIRTEEN HUNDRED FEET OF ROUGH PLANK would be required; and Mr. Stuart said he was sure that not a foot less had been used.

This it plainly appears, that instead of \$45. I should have charged Mr. Wardlaw \$58.50--\$19 more than he and his family ever contributed. Mr. Wardlaw never made, or offered to make any further settlement or remuneration for the plank, now was anything in any shape ever received from him, directly or indirectly therefor. The plank used by Mr. W. was CULLED from a large quantity that I had purchased, in raft, at \$1 $\frac{1}{2}$  per hundred. It certainly was incumbent on him to return the like quantity and the like QUALITY; and in doing do,

he would have discharged the mere debt of borrowing; whether I had paid one or ten dollars per hundred. But if he deferred repayment; and obliged me to purchase other plank of like quality, and quantity ( I did purchase from Mr. Ecker 2000 ft. for the church seats. for which I paid him \$90 in cash ) he was surely THEN justly chargeable with whatever sum it actually cost to replace what he had borrowed, and so long neglected to return.-- On the 13th Sept. '37, I purchased from Mr. Chauvin 2000 ft. pine plank at \$3.75--and 1228 ft at \$4. And two days afterwards the 2000 ft of select plank at \$4<sup>1</sup>/<sub>2</sub> was purchased from Eckhart--it was selected by Mr. Taggart expressly to make the seats, and could not have been of any better quality than that taken by Mr. Wardlaw.

Giving Mr. Chamberlain's people full credit for every cent they actually contributed in any way, towards building the church, and it will not amount to over FIFTY DOLLARS; and this includes \$20 subscribed and paid in work, by John I. Long, who never was one of Mr. C's decided adherents.

And yet they had the assurance to claim and demand the whole property. Verily some people ARE mightily troubled with MODESTY.

206

The following is copied from Rev. F. R. Gray's letter to "Messrs. Thos. Lindsay-Ias. H. Black and Sam'l G. Watson, Elders of St. Charles Presbyterian Church." This letter has been refer'd to in page 8 of my narrative--and some other places. I make large extracts--the original lying before me.

Columbia, Missouri, Feb'y 18, 1835.

"Dear Brethern:

Your letter of the 25th inst. was rec'd on the 3rd inst., also one from a private member of your church this morning, setting forth the state, and wishes of your church and the PROBABLE STATE, in case I did not accept your invitation-- beside these, I have had personal interviews with one or two members of your church about the same matter. And now what to say or reply, I scarce can tell. Difficulties seem to multiply on every side, the longer I look at it. Did I not know that the Lord whom I hope we all love and serve, can bring order out of confusion, it would appear that discord and ruin awaited some of our church. I am sometimes ready to censure myself heavily, because I did not leave St. Charles Monday morning after Synod adjourned, without preaching in your town at all. I am almost afraid I have been the cause of dissatisfaction among you. But my only consolation, if such be the fact, is, it was not my design or desire--I do most ardently wish every church in the state had a good minister who would be useful among them. It is very unpleasant to be the cause of division or dissention, either intentionally or unintentionally. It is not desirable to take sides in contrversy of this kind, either IN FACTS or by implication. It is disagreeable to be the cause of offences at any time, or in any way. But it would appear as though I am so placed at present, that offense must come somewhere, act as I may. You represent ( and the members of your church represent ) that in case I refuse to accept your invitation, your church will divide. It is result much to be lamented. We ought rather to suffer wrong. The church is weak enough at best, but if dissention broke out, and envy and ill will sh'd occupy the place that confidence & love sh'd hold, the moral power of the ch. is gone. The fav'r of God is forfeited, and a weapon is given to infidelity and wickedness that they will not forbear to use for the destruction of the cause of Christ. I lament most bitterly the danger that stares you in the face,

207

from the imprudent and presumptuous course of one of our ministers. I am fully satisfied of the impropriety of that man settling among you. I am human probably it would be the ruin of your church. Past experience and observation shows, that he has nearly ruined every church in the state, where he has lived. And never did he go to any of them under such unfavourable circumstances, as he would NOW go to St. Charles. I am therefore, with the knowledge I have of the man, his family, his history as a minister, &c., prepared to sympathise with you, and do anything the Lord in his providence would direct, to avert such a calamity ~~would~~. It is probable I shall be in Franklin in a day or two: if I think anything can be done to dissuade him from such a step, I will make the effort. I know it will probably bring me under his IRE, but if there is a probability of preventing him, I care not for that. I had rather be under the anger of five such men, than have a church of my master destroyed. There are other things I shall be under disagreeable necessity of talking to him about. - - - - - To accept the invitation you have kindly given me to become your minister, I cannot as yet see my way clear. The difficulties in the way are various. Some of them I will state-- And I will begin at home.. And 1st.-- I do not think I have talents that are requisite for a minister who would labour at St. Charles steadily. There is a strong current of infidelity and wickedness there to be met and encountered. And what is worse, the BEAST exercises his influence there? You would need a man of strong mind, and FINE EDUCATION. I have neither. You need a man not afraid of controversy; I am disposed usually to take wrong rather than contend.

2nd. There church here are ENTIRELY UNITED that I should stay. They will not be contented long without a minister. If I leave them they will not be united in the choice of any other; unless some one should come along that no one knows at present. And the strong probability is, if I leave them, they will be thrown precisely in the same condition your church is at present, and with the same individuals. There are a few individuals in this church, I am told, would be strong for giving him an invitation, if I leave. The more discerning part of the church would be opposed, dreading the same evil that you probably dread now.-- the strong probability is, they would be thrown into turmoil and confusion.. Mr. C. would of course, put in, if there was a tolerable opportunity; and no one can tell where the matter would end.

3rd. If I should accept your invitation, I must ride right over an invitation from Calloway County, where the people are entirely united in the choice, as they are here, or in St. Charles; and where they seem about as anxious on the subject; and also where there is a promising field of usefulness. It is true; there is not the same difficulty to be there apprehended in the case of a refusal as in either of the others. For they are a people who think, as every church ought to, that it is better to have no minister, than to have one that would brake the peace and union of the church: without much probability of usefulness. They are not very likely to permit a man to settle among them on whom they cannot unite. They have been destitute now, more than a year; they are becoming more & more anxious to have a minister: And Mr. C. might perhaps be a disturbance there. By remaining here at one of these points, I can probably manage to keep both quiet until one or the other can be supplied. This is however only an opinion of myself & one or two others, so far as I know for I have not stated it to more than that number.

4th There are but five ministers in this Presbytery. A Presbytery cannot do business without THREE ministers as you know. One of this number is at this time Mr. C. as you have lately had reason to know. He is not the choice of any church in the Presbytery; neither is there a church in the Presbytery, where he can settle as their minister without difficulty and dissent. Under these circumstances, the only probability is, that he must leave the Presbytery-- An other of this number, is a Physician and a Farmer, and has never attended a regular meeting of the Presbytery, and we have no assurance that he ever will. So that we dare not depend on him for anything. That will then reduce the Presbytery to THREE MINISTERS, barely



211 a constitutional quorum. And if one of these three sh'd leave, he will be compelled still to hold his connection with them, and meet with them, or they cannot do business. If he should get a dismissal ( which would not be probable ) the Presbytery would be virtually dissolved, until some other sh'd become a member of it. Where such minister is to come from, I know not--there is a possibility of a young Bro. at this time, in Ky. who spent the last year in Tennessee coming to this country in the spring, so soon as some business in Ky. can be settled; but it is only a possibility. He is a young man of popular talents, and may be settled in Ky. before he could be ready to leave the state. And further: there is no certainty he would settle in this Presbytery were he to come out. But I think that the probability is, that he would. These are some of the principal difficulties in the way of my accepting your invitation, And there are some very difficult for me to get over. I feel the situation between all these to be exceedingly critical; and that to determine I know not. I have as many difficulties perhaps more, against remaining here or going to Callaway, as settling among you, on the ground of local circumstances merely. And perhaps the reason may be, I know more about either than about your church. But let difficulties be what they may, I think I would be willing to do what ever was the will of my Master, if I knew it. But the matter is to know what he would have me do. I can see no way to determine, but to take the whole case and all the circumstances and according to the best judgment I can form of what would do most good, and prevent most mischief, that to do. This I have tried to do: and have laid the course again and again before my Lord and Master and asked Him to direct me; and after all, I can hardly determine. Sometimes things look one way and sometimes another: but generally they have appeare to me as tho' I ought not to leave the Missouri Presbytery, and of course as tho' I could not come to St. Charles. However, I cannot remain much longer in doubt: the matter must necessarily be determined some way very soon.

212 There is one thing I will mention more. I believe fully the propriety of holding CAMP MEETINGS, at least in this country. And the willingness and activity with which a ch: enter into these, I have found to be a sure test of the active party of that church. I do not know whether YOUR CHURCH would be willing to enter into it heart and hand or not. I WOULD NOT LOVE to settle in a church where they would n t, lest we should not agree very well about it. It is one strong objection I have to remain here. They go to a camp meeting as if they were going, almost to the gallows; and I have already found, where the practicability of them had been seen, as it has in this country, and the church had so little self denial as to refuse to hold one, or do it grudgingly because it was a little trouble and expense, that such ch: has generally remained in a cold and barren condition. The reason is plain--they do not love the Lord and his cause with all their hearts--they are unwilling to humble themselves sufficiently. And the Lord will not pour his blessing on them. They come before the Lord to ask his blessing and their hands are defiled with cupidity, and their hearts with love of ease, and the Lord will not have them/ He will have his people come with clean hands and pure hearts, before he blesses largely. I hope YOUR church are not of this spirit, and if any of them are they will throw it away as soon as possible. My present opinion is that it is not my duty to accept your invitation. This opinion however, is not entirely free from doubt. I will endeavour to write you again in two or three weeks, and tell you POSITIVELY YEA OR NAY. I have written you lengthily, and tried to do it plainly and candidly. I have done it in the spirit of meekness and affection --whether it appears so or not you will judge-- remember me in affection to all the dear brother & sisters. Tell Sister Sibley I am thankful for her favor and pray she may not lose her reward. With esteem and strong desires for the prosperity of your ch: and the growth in grace and holy living & enjoyment of yourselves & the members of yr. Ch: I remain yr: brother in the Lord.

F. R. GRAY.

Instead of extracts, I have copied Mr. G's letter ENTIRE. Not long after it was written, Mr. G. met Mr. Chamberlain in Franklin; as herein before related.

\* \* \* \* \*

214 The foregoing communication from Mr. Gray to our ruling Elders, left it barely probable that their invitation would be accepted. The subsequent interview at Franklin with Mr. Chamberlain settled the matter. Mr. Gray gave his negative answer soon after his conversation with Mr. C. --- I copy this letter here, to preserve it; as a Document bearing materially on the MERITS of "THE CHAMBERLAIN DISTURBANCE." -- It testifies among other things, as to Mr. C's general standing among the churches in his own Presbytery; and affords good argument why the church of St. Charles should be aware of him. But the ch: of St. C. needed not this additional evidence. They had taken their decided stand against him, and could not be moved.

Mr. Gray's letter shows also, that the church of St. Charles was not the only one liable to be thrown into confusion on account of a minister. Not the only ch: in which the choice of a Pastor was likely to produce division in sentiment if not disunion. And by no means singular in its opposition to the admission of Mr. Chamberlain. So far as Mr. Gray's opinion may be authority, on those points, his letter is conclusive, and properly belongs in this history.---

215 The following is copied from the ST. LOUIS OBSERVER of 14th April, 1835. It is Mr. Chamberlain's appeal from the Synod of Missouri to the General Assembly.

Marion College Mo. Octo. 22nd, 1835.

To the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church to be convened in Pittsburg on May 1836.

Dearly Beloved Brethern:

The undersigned minister in the character of stated supply, and Ruling Elders of the church of St. Charles, feeling ourselves aggrieved and oppressed, under a high sense of imperious duty and necessity. Appeal and complain to the highest Indicatory of our beloved church.

216 We appeal from and complain of several acts of the Synod of Missouri passed at their recent Session, began on 15th, which deprived A. B. Campbell of his seat in Synod, when he had been duly elected by a clear majority of 4 out of 7 ruling Elders, and gave that seat to Thomas Lindsay, elected by a minority of Elders. 2nd.- The act of the 17th, which dismissed the appeal, Doc. No. 1 of the papers before Synod, as informal and unconstitutionally made. Thus severing the minister from his friends, and making him stand alone in a united cause. This act was based on an erroneous principle; that to deprive ruling Elders of office and a minister of his congregation was not an appealable act. --3rd.--The act of the 20th refusing to sustain our appeal and complaints. 4th--The act of the 21st adopting their final minute, in reference to the several cases involved; which minute severs a minister from his people, and disrobes three ruling Elders duly elected and ordained; of their Holy offices.

5th--The acts or votes rejecting the following resolutions, moved by ourselves and others, in different stages of their business, & deemed by us indispensable to the ends of Justice.

Resolution 1: We the complainants in the case now before Synod, move this court, that in consideration of the fact that Rev. Elijah P. Lovejoy has prejudged this case, that he is connected by marriage with the party opposed to us, and in a manner identified with them; that he is held forth by them as one of their candidates: therefore he is and ought to be considered unqualified to sit in judgm't. We also move that he be qualified by the prescribed oath to prove these facts.

SIGNED-- H. CHAMBERLAIN  
A. B. CAMPBELL  
WM. SPENCER.

Res. 2nd: Whereas, there is very much important testimony wanting in this case; without which B equal justice cannot be done to all parties. Therefore resolved that this Synod Adjourn to meet in the town of St. Charles the ----- day of----- at 11 o'clock A. M. for the purpose of thoroughly investigating the cause.

217

Res. 3d: Resolved, that this case be dismissed from this Body, and sent down to the lower Judicatory, with instructions to organize a Second Church in St. Charles. 6.

Res. 4th: Resolved-that this Synod appoint a committee of three Ministers, two Elders to repair to St. Charles with plenipotentiary powers, to call the people together and hold a protracted meeting, for purposes of peace and reconciliation, on such terms as will D enable the present minister to REMAIN or RETIRE, with the consent of all parties. That the present Moderator, whose opinions in the case are unknown, shall preside. That Brother Yantis, whose opinions are also unknown, and brother Gallaher, an avowed friend of the act complained of, be associated with him.

The foregoing Resolutions were successively debated and set aside by Synod; and the last was designed to heal the bleeding # wounds of the church of Christ, and was particularly and especially rebutted by Rev. Elijah P. Lovejoy and consequently lost. Thus seeing all our attempts to secure an impartial trial, and what we deem our interest and unalienable rights, have failed, We believe it to be our solemn and religious duty to appeal to a higher court. In taking this step, however, we do promptly and cheerfully reciprocate that kind and Christian feeling, which so clearly appears in the last minute of Synod referred to in this appeal, as Act. No. 4. We rejoice with unfeigned joy, that both by evidence & intercourse Synod has been constrained to do ample justice to the character & standing of a Gospel Minister & an injured people,- that the prejudices of all parties have yielded to a vast extent, and that after mingling in what by some might be deemed keen intellectual strife-- the spirit of heaven seemed to descend upon us all in softened and subdued feeling. We are also impelled by our own sense of duty and right, to deal out an ample measure of justice, to the motives and intentions of Synod, in adopting their final minute. We believe them to have been pure in heart; tho' mistaken in judgment--and this mistake in judgment we ascribe to the fact, that full TWO THIRDS of our testimony was excluded on Constitutional grounds.

218

The Judicatory would not appoint a delegation to take this testimony in due form as our law directs. They refused to adjourn for further trial. The inferior Judicatory had given us no notice; and thus were we deprived of our rights of evidence. Some of our judges had prejudged the case, and could not as human nature is constructed, be prevailed upon to open their minds to that new light which remained to be shed upon it.

The great efforts which had been made to prepossess their minds, their distance from the field of observations, in all cases save one, and his near relationship to the opposing party, prevented a safe & judicious decision. Add to all this, the fact that there was not a quorum of judges. The parties being excluded, and the Moderator not voting, the real judges in this case were only 5 in number; and of these Rob't. L. Mc Afee & Sam'l L. Hart most explicitly declared that in their opinion the final vote ought not to be taken without further evidence, & a more constitutional & thorough investigation. They farther declared that the failure of evidence was no fault of ours--that they knew of no way in which we could have produced constitutional testimony exparte mode of proceeding in the inferior court. Thus do we account for a failure in judgment which we believe to be read, without impugning the motives of our judges, or feeling any disposition to do so: And to remedy these serious evils & obtain what we deem indispensable justice, we appeal and complain for the following reasons:

219

FIRST : We hold it to be our right to be tried by an impartial bench of Judges; and when a member has on his own admission prejudged the case, and leaves his seat as a judge to enter into ardent debate, we deny the expediency or propriety of his sitting in judgment on us.

SECOND : We hold that to be a wise and necessary provision in the constitution of our church, that its rulers shall take into consideration all the circumstances which give character to conduct, & render it more or less offensive; and that therefore this case should never have been decided by Synod until the evidence was fully taken.

THIRD : We hold that any act of the church Judicatory, which in view of testimony, written or oral, passes sentence, or deprives of privileges, or misconstrues law to the injury of a party; is an appealable act; and may be complained of, or appealed from, at the discretion of the injured; and that it is in substance & spirit a TRIAL, whenever character is involved.

220 FOURTH : We hold that no man or Body of men can be constitutionally tried & condemned by ex parte evidence, and without their knowledge, as was the fact in our case in the lower Judicatory; and that the idea of this being a mere declarative act, which admitted not the remedy of appeal is a principle fraught with danger and injustice.

FIFTH : We believe in denying to A. B. Campbell his seat on the first day of the Session, did virtually strengthen the prejudice against our cause, and virtually prejudice our cause, in regard to the legality & propriety of our proceedings.

SIXTH : We believe according to the unborken practice of the churches in Missouri from their earliest date, that THREE of the Old Session did WITHOUT APPLYING TO PRESBYTERY FOR LEAVE, invite, and had a right to invite Mr. Chamberlain to labor among us five or six weeks; even tho' a fourth Elder was openly opposed. E

SEVENTH : We believe that when petitioned by a very large majority of the church & congregation, each member of that Session was under an individual responsibility to the Constitution and to his constituents, to call a meeting of the congregation for the purpose of choosing a stated supply; and that therefore A. B. Campbell did right to perform his duty, while three of his Brother Elders refused to do theirs. And we know not how he could have done otherwise, without laying himself open to rebuke & censure, as an officer of the church for violating the constitution. F.

221 EIGHTH : We believe that when that meeting was assembled, it was thier undoubted right if they chose to insist on an election, which thing did SELF MOVED and without any agency of the candidate, who was far distant, and in deep affliction at the time.

NINTH : We believe that when THREE of the former Session withdrew from such a very respectalbe meeting of the church & congregation, with a violent protest, they did virtually throw themselves out of their official relation to the church, until they should be brought back by the strong arm of ecclesiastical law, or with subdued feelings, voluntarily return to act their part as their own sense of duty might indicate. G

TENTH : We believe it was the original inherent, as well as ir was the constitutional right of the congregation, to be represented in their Session, and that therefore, they had a right to demand as in truth they did demand, thro' their Elder then standing alone, after his fellows had abandoned him, the free and untrammalled election of additional elders.

For the basis of these opinions see form of Government, preliminary principles, Chap. 15, Sec. 5th: chap. 3rd, sec. 2: Chap. 5,;sChap. 8, Sec. 1; Chap. 13th, Sec. 2nd, 5th, 7th. See also minutes of Assembly 1830 page 9th.

222 ELEVENTH: We believe these Elders were solemnly, & judiciously, and peacefully set apart in the proscribed form of our church, and ought not to be, and cannot be disrobed. Mrs. Spencer (H) was not duly elected at first being not a member of our church; but when received by letter, he was RECHOSEN, and THEN, and not TILL then, ordained.

TWELFTH: We believe the congregation did right in leaving the dissident party to be convinced by time, experience, & grace of their great error; and in regarding their own interests & self preservation, by procuring the immediate administration of the bread of life to a starving people;— that the changes and destitutions known to exist here, demanded that they should secure the auspicious moments to supply themselves, as indeed they did: a formal application to a distant Presbytery would have occasioned a delay of months, embarrassed the congregation, and defeated the prospect of obtaining a supply. (J) The Session consisting of all the then active Elders, did, as in duty bound, on the 11th May, invite Mr. Chamberlain to supply them one year, and to this end he entered the only official door into the church; without stopping to inquire what had become of those who had broken themselves off, and thrown themselves out of the pale of the church as far as entire absence could do it.

223 THIRTEENTH: We believe there was no necessity or expediency, of obeying literally Chap. 15, in the installation of a STATED SUPPLY: as that is neither the common law of Missouri, or the great West, and practice in this case becomes law. A stated supply ~~is~~ is never installed as such, by Presbytery.

FOURTEENTH: We believe that in the election of ruling Elders, there was not one dissenting voice; that the congregation were duly assembled by the direction of the only acting Elder (K); that a clear majority, in the exercise of their constitutional rights, determined on an election: that two weeks public notice of the time and place of said electors, was ample; & that the election in all respects was lawful and right.

FIFTEENTH: We also believe that according to the usages of the Presbyterian church, slaves ought not to be admitted as voters in any case; and that their names are improperly arrayed against us.

224 SIXTEENTH: We once more reassert and maintain the right and propriety of proving on evidence, that the dissident Elders had used unlawful means of separating from us our friends; of forcing them to subscribe their papers or leave the church; that they have used means which do not belong to them: and also to prove in evidence, that their measures one and all, have been oppressive, and inconsistent with the great doctrines of Civil liberty, as held in the 19th century ( See Emmon's testimony ) these we hold to be urgent reasons (L) why the minister and his associates Elders, the real representatives of the people, should not be, by a high handed coercion severed from the congregation. When in the language of Christian meekness and mildness we are advised to yield the rights of a large majority into the hands of a minority, for the peace of the church, and the good of all; we find it in our hearts to obey; and nothing but an imperious sense of duty could induce us to hold on our way, after receiving such counsel. But when again we think of abandoning the cause of a people that love us, and confide in us; of disrobing ourselves of office, of yielding up into the hands of a minority and of a Session not representing their constituents: a people that have been struggling for years for their rights, and have not yet even obtained and established them; and when we think moreover of this abandoning the great cause of Religious Liberty: the real cause of the world; and sealing by our act the litigant cause of oppression; we turn again to our purpose, and stand firm at our post, even tho' the voice of affection invite us away. We look for our justification before the Assembly, in the PECULIAR and LONG DIVIDED state of the congregation, in the manifest impossibility of reuniting them under the administration of the former Session; while the representatives of their choice are laid aside; and in other facts and circumstances, which cannot be known

225

untill they are proved; & we do hold ourselves now, & in all future time, in perfect readiness to present ample testimony from witnesses who have signed "propria manu", or who may testify "propria persona", whenever the judicatory of our church shall employ constitutional means to bring them before them. Such, dearly beloved Brethern, are our reasons for appeal and complaint. We hope that our humble condition in the remote west, will not prevent you from a most prayerful consideration of our cause: for the post we occupy is not always destined to be obscure in the history of the States; and great principles of conduct are worthy to be well considered, and well settled, whoever may be litigant parties, We ask the Assembly to order a new trial of this whole case, where we may be fully heard, if they deem it necessary to the end of justice; and if they do not, we entreat them to recommend or direct the inferior Judicatory to organize the opposing party into a new church, where they may enjoy their privileges, even as we do ours. That this may be done with due regard to the rights of property held by the church--this would be at once just and peaceful; and we earnestly desire it for the good of all.

Respectfully, your brethen in the Bond of the Gospel.--

H. CHAMBERLAIN

A. B. CAMPBELL

P. CAYCE

B. R. WARDLAW

WM. SPENCER.

226

Extracts from the proceedings of the Synod of Missouri refered to in the Appeal of Mr. Chamberlain.

"The judicial Committee Report to the Synod, that certain papers have been put into their hands, which they have numbered 1, 2, 3 and 4, together with accompanying Documentary evidence.\*

DOC: No. 1. purports to be an appeal for reasons therein set forth, from certain acts of the St. Charles Presbytery, forwarded to the appellants under date of June 5th, 1835, which appeal is signed by A. B. Campbell & others, in behalf of the congregation of St. Charles.

DOC. No. 2. purports to be a complaint of H. Chamberlain to the Synod of Missouri, for reasons assigned in the preceding paper; so far farth as those reasons do not personally affect the complainant.

DOC: No. 3. purports to be a complaint of A. B. Campbell, a ruling Elder, in the church of St. Charles, of the doing of St. Charles Presbytery, in depriving him of his seat in that body at their meeting convened at Salem.

DOC: No. 4. is signed by H. Chamberlain and others; and purports to be an appeal from a complaint of, certain acts of St. Charles Presbytery at their Session of October 9th, 1835. The reason for which appeal & complaint are duly set forth.

227

In regard to these papers, the committee are of opinion, that the appeal contained in the Doc. No. 1, cannot come before Synod; inasmuch as it appears from the paper itself, as well as from the Records of the presbytery, THAT NO JUDICIAL DECISION HAS BEEN HAD IN THE CASE. The parties appealing have never been irregularly tried\*-- and the Act appealed from was simply a declaratory one, founded on ex parte testimony altogether. And our Book of Discipline ( Chap 7, Sec. 3 ) decided that no such case can be carried by appeal from a lower to a higher Judicatory. And there is the less need of bringing this paper before Synod, inasmuch as the whole case is embraced in others, as will appear. The Committee therefore recommend that the appeal be dismissed, as informal and unconstitutionally made.

Doc. No. 2 Is signed by H. Chamberlain: and appears to adopt the paper marked No. 1, as containing the subject matter, and the reason of complaint: In this sense the Committee regard it as a regular COMPLAINT to Synod, and recommend that it be received.

DOC. No. 3. Is a regular complaint of A. B. Campbell of certain doings of the St. Charles Presbytery, attended with a slight informality, in that it does not give the date of that Session of the Presbytery, whose acts are complained of. The committee recommend to Synod that Mr. Campbell have leave to amend and that his complaint be received.

DOC. No. 4. appears to the Committee to be in all respects, a regular complaint to this Body, of the Acts of St. Charles Presbytery: and as such, they recommend that it be received.--

228

On motion, resolved, that the complaints of H. Chamberlain & others, be taken up & acted on in regular order. Synod went into an interlocutory meeting, for the purpose of hearing Rev. H. Chamberlain read sundry documents, &c.-- On motion it was ordered, that attested copies of the documents read by Bro. Chamberlain be put upon file. These papers are numb.'d 7, 8, 9, 10, 11. \* \* \* \* \*

The Moderator qualified Dr. B. Graham & Messrs Campbell and Spencer as witnesses, and the clerk was appointed to write down their testimony--which testimony was taken according to the direction of our Book of discipline. -- The Synod proceeded to take the testimony of Mr. A. B. Campbell \* \* \* \* \* An extract from a letter written by Bro. Gray to Mr. Wardlaw was read by Bro. Chamberlain. Also a certificate, which was sworn to see paper marked No. 3. ( This is a long narrative of " B. B. WARDLAW, clk. of the Session " of the proceedings in relation to Mr. Chamberlain from 1st Monday in January 1835 to 20th May ) Dr. B. Graham was then examined \* \* \* \* \* A letter was read by Mr. Chamberlain from Sundry persons in St. Chas. dated 27th April, 1829 ( Mkd. No. 5 ) He also read some extracts from a DOCUMENT mkd No 6 \* \* \* \* \*

The Synod having heard the original parties, and the Presbytery of St. Charles being fully heard on the subject matter of Doc No 2. The Synod proceeded to the consideration of the complaint; after which it was resolved that the decision on this complaint be deferred 'till the remaining complaints shall have been fully heard.

229

It was **RESOLVED, THE PARTIES HAVING GIVEN THEIR CONSENT;** that all the papers relating to the remaining complaints, be submitted to the hands of Synod, without remark of debate, for their decision.--

The Synod then retired to consult & deliberate in private, previous to coming to a decision upon the complaints before them. After some time spent thus in private; The Synod decided **UNANIMOUSLY** that the complaints **BE NOT SUSTAINED.**

The final minute of Synod.

In adopting a minute declarative of their views on the several subjects brought before them in the complaints of Bro. Chamberlain & others, Synod express their anxious solicitude, as a Court of JESUS CHRIST, to mete out equal and impartial & brotherly love that becomes us as officers in a Christian Church, that their decision may be such as will remove them at once & forever.

And previously to recording their decisions on the several points before them, it is with unfeigned satisfaction, that Synod emphatically declare they have seen nothing in all the proceedings before them that does in the least degree implicate the moral character or purity of motive of any individual concerned; and they desire especially and particularly to apply this remark to the MINISTERIAL character and standing of Bro. Chamberlain--they are both **UNIMPEACHED.**

230

It is in evidence before Synod, that a Petition was presented to the Session of the Church of St. Charles requesting them to call a meeting of the Congregation to choose a pastor, or stated supply. If the Session had evidence that this petition was signed by **A MAJORITY OF THE MEMBERS**, it was their duty to call the meeting. In case of their refusing, the remedy of the majority was a complaint to

Presbytery. It appears to Synod that a majority signed this petition; and that therefore the meeting should have been called. It is further in evidence, that a meeting of the ch: of St. Charles WAS called by an individual member of the Session, WITHOUT THE CONCURRENCE OF OTHER THREE MEMBERS OF SESSION; at which meeting it was Resolved to choose three additional Elders, which was subsequently done. This Act Synod judge irregular and void; because the Session ALONE possess the power of convening the ch: whereas in this case while there were four acting Elders, this meeting was called by one, in opposition to the three. And it is also in evidence, THAT A MAJORITY OF THE CHURCH DID NOT VOTE FOR THE ADDITIONAL ELDERS.- It follows of course, that all the acts of these New Elders, purporting to be the Acts of the Session of the Church of St. Charles, including the proceedings had in inviting Mr. Chamberlain there, are irregular. It also appears, that the Session of the Church did not make a representation of the nature of a REFERENCE ( which they were competent to do ) to the Presbytery of St. Charles, on which representation that Presbytery decided that they would not recognize the election of the additional Elders, and advised Mr. Chamberlain to leave the place.

231

On this the Synod judge, that the Presbytery had consitutional right so to act; at the same time Synod do not think the course pursued by that Presbytery judicious; but that they should rather have cited the parties, or sent a commission, so as to bring the whols case, with all its circumstances, distinctly before the Presbytery. It is further judged by Synod, that altho' the Presby of St. Charles had the right to require the ch: of St. Charles to observe all constitutional rules, they go beyond their line when they allay a requisition on Mr. Chamberlain; as he was not a member of their body, nor accountable to them. If he WAS guilty of disorderly conduct, their remedy was complaint to his Presbytery. Even advice from them to him was a gratuity; for which if tendered in the spirit of Christian kindness, he ought doubtless to be thankful. for, but which he was not bound to follow officially.

232

Synod further say, that no statements should have been made or allowed, derogatory to Mr. Chamberlain's character in the representation of the Session of St. Charles to the Presbytery, other than a simple statement of the facts involved in the difficulties in that church-- As he was not on trial, nor even present; and had no opportunity of defence. And also all attempts before Synod to fix on the Session, the charge of tyranny, except so far as relates to the case actually under investigation, were wholly wrong, as they were not on trial, and had no proper means of defence. FINALLY, In view of all the circumstances of the case, Synod would most affectionately advise Bro. Chamberlain to seek another field of labor than St. Charles. The field of usefulness is wide, and there are many doors thro' which this field may be entered. The talents and experience of Bro. Chamberlain, abundantly qualify him to labor in the field with success: We hope he will see it his duty to act in accordance with these suggestions; and in so doing he is assured, that in what ever part of the Lord's Vineyard he may be found laboring, he will be accompanied and followed by the best wishes, the prayers and the Christian fellowship of the members of this Synod. To the members of the St. Charles church of both parties, Synod recommend forbearance, forgiveness and earnest endeavors by mutual confessions and explanations, to come together again; and carefully avoid all recrimination hereafter: to live harmoniously as Brethern, having "One Lord, one faith and one Baptism."

---

The above final minute offering such good Christian advice to the parties litigant, at its close, was adopted and read in Synod on the 2nd Octo:-- And as if purposely to close the door of reconciliation in our church; Mr. Chamberlain on the very next



233 day re-enter the field of litigation "Strife and disturbance" by his appeal by his appeal to the Gen'l Assembly, and before his party, or even his New Elders could have time to reflect, or to take counsel; or his "opponents" to offer the hand of Christian friendship to his followers in compliance with the Synod's advice; he INSTANTLY commits himself, his Elders and "his friends" for another campaign of indefinite duration.

The reasons assigned by Mr. C. are, to say the least of them, very unsatisfactory. In truth the whole Document ( the Appeal ) is a tissue of misrepresentation, blundering, and folly. It sets out with false assumptions; and ends with deceptions and mischievous propositions.

The whole of this document I am very safe in ascribing to Mr. Chamberlain; for tho' other names are appended to it, no one acquainted with the individuals would for a moment suppose that any other MIND or WILL but Mr. C's. either advised or controlled the production. BESIDES, two at least, of the persons whose names appear at the bottom of the appeal, were not at or near "Marion College" at the time that it purports to have been written and signed. --I will EN PASSANT, add a few comments on this curious document.

234 It is not true that the COMPLAINT of Mr. C. was refused by Synod. The complaint was fully entertained and fully acted on, as the proceedings abundantly prove.--tho' not taken up as an appeal.

1st.-- The attempt to disqualify Mr. Lovejoy as a member of the Court (A) and thus to prevent his sitting on the trial of Mr. C's complaint was perfectly ridiculous. The reason assigned were false and absurd. The specification that Mr. Lovejoy was "CONNECTED BY MARRIAGE WITH THE PARTY OPPOSED TO US" and thus "IN A MEASURE IDENTIFYING HIM" with Mr. C's Opponents, is, to say the least of it, very weak & far fetched. Mr. Lovejoy was no otherwise WEDDED to the party than by his having married Miss French, a member of our church, who had declined to connect herself with Mr. C's party. She had no other relative in the church except her sister. Neither she or her sister ever took any particular interest in the controversy, as was very well known.

235 Mr. Lovejoy was not, nor ever had been a candidate for the church at St. Charles, as Mr. Chamberlain must have known I am sure. When the Session were requested to invite Mr. Gray ( at the meeting in November 1834 ) they were at the same time desired to obtain the temporary services of Mr. Lovejoy or Mr. Brown, or some other minister, 'till Mr. Gray could come. ( See page 3 & 4 of my narrative ) But Mr. Lovejoy declined coming, being otherwise engaged. If he had been a candidate, he would most probably have done. But he, as well as Mr. C., very well knew that the Session could not with any propriety, recognize ANY candidate whilst the invitation directed to be given to Mr. Gray was pending. If Mr. Lovejoy had accepted the invitation for the six weeks, as authorised by the church meeting; we should most probably have been spared Mr. Chamberlain's VISTITATION.

This whole paragraph is nonsense. It is nonsense or worse; for whilst Mr. Chamberlain strives to set Mr. Lovejoy aside for the reasons assigned, he complains that Mr. Alex. B. Campbell, who was HIS open, active, zealous PARTISAN, was not allowed by Synod to sit in judgment on his case.

236 2nd.: Mr. Chamberlain's bitter complaints about his (B) lack of testimony, and want of time to obtain it are all set forth for deception. Had his "opponents" asked for a commission to take further testimony in St. Charles, or elsewhere, Mr. C. would certainly have opposed it. In point of fact, he was already armed with TOO MUCH testimony before Synod; and thus managed to PROVE what was NOT TRUE, at least on one very material point; and by that means brought undeserved censure upon Messrs. Lindsay, Watson & Black.

I allude to the ALLEGED presentation to them of the petition to call the church and congregation together for the election of Mr. C. , which those Elders positively & solemnly deny.

Had such a commission as Mr. Chamberlain PRETENDED to desire ( but which he knew from the first Synod must refuse ) been ordered; I risk nothing when I say, that evidence would have been produced amply sufficient to silence that Rev.' Gentleman in Missouri at the least. HE fully enjoyed this opportunity in Sept. 1836 under every possible advantage; the whole fruits of which ( a large volume ) he lugged before the General Assembly; and there used as he best knew how-- And yet the result was his exposure and complete discomfiture. And NOW the truth is perfectly plain, as to the real object of all his appeals, complaints & manoeuvring, namely, to gain time, and afford him some pretence to prolong his visitation in St. Charles to break down, and ruin ANOTHER church.

3rd:-- (C) Mr. Chamberlain and his Elders it should be remembered , claimed to be the first Presbyterian Ch. of St. Charles. Their "opponents" were of course to be organized as the second church according to the advice here given--- Here the grand object ( to possess themselves of our church property ) peeped out pretty plainly.

4th:-- (D) A protracted meeting in connection with a church quarrel!! No wonder the Synod rejected a proposition so strange and revolting!

"Bleeding wounds, &c."-- Who caused these wounds? Synod held one opinion of all this flummery. and Mr. C. another.--which was most likely to be right?

Mr. C. is over-complimentary to the Synod &c., but seems to forget that his "opponents," the first church, are any body. "The spirit of heaven" &c. alas, Mr. C. will not admit that this spirit gave wisdom. Alas poor misguided Synod. The matter of controversy so perfectly plain in itself, was always MISITIFIED in Mr. Chamberlain's hands, by the introduction ( if allowed ) of interminable irrelevant nonsense; touching his own purity of purpose , immaculate character, &c, and attempts to villify the motive and character of his "OPONENTS."

E-- Herer Mr. Chamberlain plainly means to tell the Gen'l Assembly, that only ONE of the Elders of the church refused to invite him for the six weeks, when in truth THREE of the m refused; as the Rev'd gentleman must have known.

F-- Mr. C. here, as usual, assumes as a fact, what is NOT true, about the MAJORITY. His minority Elder, Campbell, agreeably to Mr. Chamberlain's curious logic, and uniform advice; was never to allow himself to be governed or influenced by the majority of the Session, tho' three to one against him; and to say the least, quite as likely as himself to act from correct views & an enlightened judgment.

G-- O what reasoning-- One of four Elders dissenting from his brethern, has the right to outlaw and punish the other Three!! Mr. C. will always insist that Mr. Campbell's will and judgment must be taken as the standard. It is uniformly held by the Rev'd gentleman that the Elders Lindsay, Watson and Black, must have been in error, whenever they presumed to differ in their judgment from Campbell. Thus because those three seriously opposed the proceeding of Mr. Campbell in calling and holding the meeting to elect Mr. Chamberlain pastor of the church. The THREE are pronounced to be in state of open rebellion against the authority of the ONE; altho' the two Deacons also join in the protest.

To say that Elder Campbell was bound to act in conformity with the wishes of the "church and congregation", regardless of the counsel and disapprobation of the other three Elders and the two Deacons, and many of the most respectable SENIOR lay members of the church; is surely subversive to all order and good government.

And besides Mr. C. assumes again, what has been elsewhere already proven to be untrue--to wit, that a majority ever did sanction the meeting, or the election. No such majority existed.

240

H-- "Mr. Spencer not only elected at first"-- Why was he ever elected at all? it may be very properly asked. He not only did not live in St. Charles; but was not even an inhabitant of Missouri. Yet he was so far "only elected" as virtually to preclude the election of any other; which was no doubt the design of Mr. Chamberlain & Campbell, &c. And why adopt so strange, unusual, UNLAWFUL course? The reason is very plain and very probable. It was deemed extremely important to gain the adhesion and influence of Mr. Spencer's mother, sisters and brothers. The whole family, exclusive of the Elder Elect, numbered NINE members of the church.-- What effect this premature election of Mr. Wm. Spencer to be one of the Dignataries of Mr. Chamberlain's new organization, and his subsequent ordination; actually had on the rest of the family to influence THEIR decision, I shall not undertake to show; further than to state the fact, that they all did, without exception, become warm and zealous members of the SECESSION under Mr. Chamberlain.

241

In this whole proceeding Mr. C. displayed not a little tact, skill and discernment. But it may be questioned I think whether this sort of talent should ever be exerted in the affairs of the church. The result in this instance, fully realized the expectation of those who resorted to it.

J-- There is another most impudent assertion, upon which is built sundry false inferences. The congregation NEVER DID leave "The dissident party" as Mr. C. presumes to call the church. This whole 12th reason stands out so prominently in character as to entitle it very fairly and beyond all dispute, to be styled THE HEIGHT OF IMPUDENCE AND FOLLY. It has been sufficiently noticed and exposed in another page or pages.

K-- Here the appellant uses language eminently calculated to deceive and mislead the General Assembly. He falsely holds out, that the new Elders were elected by the unanimous voice, and concurrence of the whole church, including both parties; and until the transaction was ( after some delay ) fully explained; the Assembly did favour the position that the election was all fair and lawful, and binding on the whole church of St. Charles. The Records of Synod when sent up speedily dissipated the wicked delusion.

242 L-- This 16th REASON for appeal to the General Assembly, abounds in false assertion and false insinuations, as well as assiduously verbiage. Once more Messrs. Lindsay, Watson & Black are denounced as "The dissident Elders" representing them as having DESERTED the church they were sworn to nourish and defend; and as having used "unlawful means" oppression and tyranny, to prevent other church members from leaving THEM and joining "The Church" under Mr. Chamberlain, Mr. Campbell and the three new Elders, &c.

And this conduct of those three dissenters was not only in defiance of Presbyterial Law; but was a most barefaced attack upon the principles and "great doctrines of Civil Liberty, as held in the nineteenth century" ---- This 16th reason was deliberately written by Mr. Chamberlain, and presented to the General Assembly in the perfect knowledge, that so soon as the Records of Synod in the case, should be sent up, and examined; the whole flimsy tissue must inevitably wither and perish, ( as it did in fact ) and its author stand out disgraced in the estimation of all men of intelligence and honourable feelings.

243

The recorded testimony of Mr. Emmons, Mr. Elder Campbell and Doctor Graham; Mr. Chamberlain's own witnesses, is quite enough to invalidate everything in the likeness of a fact, set forth in this whole FANFARONADE.

244

The appellant seems to have relied entirely on obtaining a SNAP JUDGMENT from the Assembly; which he hoped to effect by disengenious management. Thus he suffered his appeal to be docketed DECEPTIVELY in the first instance ( reversing the true order of the parties, as I have already noticed ) and so allowed it to stand for about two years; 'till the Records went up from the Synod, and corrected the Docket. Mr. C. knew of this misstatement, for he actually answered AS FOR THE CHURCH; when the case was called up in the Assembly of 1837. Thus assuming the position of He and THE CHURCH, appealing. When the true attitude as he well knew, of the parties as docketed on the Synod records, was just the reverse ( See my note to Mr. Chamberlain of 24th January 1838 for a better explanation of the TRICK here referred to ) p. 55.

The following from the pen of Mr. Lindsay will furnish a sufficient commentary on Mr. Chamberlain's appeal to the General Assembly. In connection with the other facts and remarks touching this whole subject; including the final decision of the Assembly, and the final removal of the DISTURBER; the reader may most probably learn enough to satisfy him of the true character of the "Chamberlain disturbance."

245

246

The following "passing remarks" on Mr. Chamberlain's Sixteen Reasons for his appeal to the General Assembly against the Synod of Missouri; are copied from a paper in my possession; and are from the pen of Mr. Thomas Lindsay, Sen.--written probably, in April or May, 1835, for his own private use.

Reason 1st. The party charged ( Mr. Lovejoy ) must answer for himself--which he is probably abundantly able to do.

Reasons 2-3-&-4 : There was no trial or condemnation. The Session complained to the Presbytery of the unconstitutional acts of the Rev. H. Chamberlain, & a minority of the members, of the church, who in defiance of all Gov't and discipline, set themselves up as RULERS of the Church; and when they found the Session would not suffer them to force the Rev. H. C. upon the church as our Pastor, they set about electing new Elders.

247

Reason 5th; A. B. Campbell had forsaken his Brethern of the Session; and without their knowledge or consent went about among the members, in an UNDERHANDED way, to procure subscriptions for H. C., who also went about from house to house evidently to gain favor, &c.--This was in January 1835. Meanwhile, it was well known to them both that the ch<sup>a</sup> had shortly before given an unanimous vote to invite the Rev. Mr. Gray to become their Pastor; and to say the least, he was officiously intermeddling in our church affairs; uniting with and encouraging a faction to divide & distract the members of the church. But it was not until the April following, that he and his party, to overpower the Session, concluded by their own authority to create a new Session, more tractable than the old, & sufficiently strong with Mr. C. at their head, to over power the old. Until this time, the Session had forborne as much as possible; now they considered it their duty to go around & know who was schismatic, and warn them of their improper course. We found SIX who had subscribed for Rev. H. C. who declared they had been deceived, and would have nothing more to do with him and his party.

Reason 6th: "THREE ELDERS" -- Mr. Black, one of the three was sick, and did not attend the Sabbath he was to be invited for six weeks--the other Mr. Watson, voted against inviting him. About 18 members out of 50 odd, voted to invite him to stay; while 13 or 14 voted against him staying even for six weeks. 5 had gone out would have voted the same way.

248 Reason 7th: We want to see how they will make out this "LARGE MAJORITY" of the church. The annex'd statement taken from the Session book shows, that with all their contrivances, 25 or rather 24 out of 54 is all the majority they can possibly muster--it is true they promised every non-professor who would subscribe to support Mr. H. C., that they sh'd have a vote--counting such, we admit they had a majority. But on such principles it is questionable if even such men as Mr. Greatrake, or Mr. Hayden had been put up, they would not have polled Mr. Chamberlain. They call it "stated supply" but the paper said PASTOR. And they continually boast of a majority, when they are, in fact, THE MINORITY.

Reason 8th: They are right in saying "self-moved"--the meeting was called and held against the will of the Session, and a majority of the members, and without a presiding Minister, and but one out of four Elders: to elect a Pastor--"SELF-MOVED", they were not to be turned by trifles. A non-professor was first called to the chair, and took the chair; and several non-professors made speeches,-- whether the candidate had any agency in all this, is best known to themselves; But not long before the election, one leading member ( H. H. Wardlaw ) was by me heard to say, that he was pledged to Mr. Chamberlain.

Reason 9th: The members of Session could not but withdraw from such unconstitutional, partisan measures; and warn and protest against them.

249 Reason 10th: While this "SELF MOVED" party was using their influence to distract & divide the church: the Session were prosecuting the known and unanimous desire of the church: by treating with Mr. Gray to become our pastor. In this state of things on what constitutional grounds could this minority with the Rev. H. C. at their head, go about to make new Elders: In fact they saw their purposes baffled by the

firmness of the Session, and took their course accordingly--the authority they quote in justification of these high handed measures, appears to us wide of the mark. Reason 11th: Both Presbytery and Synod have already decided against the election of these new Elders, one & all as unconstitutional. Only carry out the principle that a party may ease themselves of Government by such means, and where will it lead? But we may ask what constitutional right has Mr. C. or any other minister to wander out of his own Presbytery to which he is amendable, & enter a church in a Presbytery to which he is NOT amendable? Encourage division & distraction, join a party, & even proceed to the ordination of Elders in opposition to the regular Session of the church? Were such conduct countenanced, farewell to all harmony, union and good Gov't. few churches are so happy as to be entirely free from disaffected members in some shape or other, at least for any great length of time.

Reason 12th: The Session is charged by the Schismatic members, because they expostulated and protested, and warned against the unconstitutional measures they were using, calculated to distract the church, and embarrass the Session; in prosecuting the vote of the congregation in favor of the Rev. Mr. Gray.

250 "The Session, consisting of all the THEN active Elders" that is A. B. Campbell--the other three were NOT active because they did not then act with them. A. B. Campbell, we presume, did invite the Rev. H. C. he being the only official door out of four members of Session, who would open wide enough to let this w'd be Pastor enter--by this door he was willing to SQUEEZE in, without stopping to enquire about the other three parts or leaves of the door said to be broken off.

Reason 13th: We are still of the opinion altho' the 15th Chap. may not be the law of Missouri, nor of the great West, that it would have been better for the little church of St. Charles, had it been entirely adhered to; probably it would have been united and at peace; and supplied with a faithful minister; whereas it is divided and distracted: friends made foes: those that ought to be the children

of strife and envy. Herer some reflections offer concerning those who trouble the ch: but we forbear.-- Our committee of supplies have applied to the Assembly's Board for us. We have also applied to the same source ourselves, entreat- them to send us an able, pious minister; but hitherto we have applied in vain. True, we are at present, but a little people; and we are not free from trouble. But we pray we may not be cast behind the back on that account: the time may come when fair weather and sunshine will yet revisit us.

251 Reason 14th: "Not one dissenting voice" in the election of these new Elders. We did entreat and exostule with our brethern, until the last ray of hope was fled. But the members of Session had no wish to take an active hand in that case with the stray brother. They further add, "that a clear majority in the exercise of their constitutional rights, determined on an election." It seems quite CLEAR they were determined to elect the Rev. H. C.; and it is highly probable that a "clear majority" of those determined ones voted. Whether they exercised a constitutional right in all this, is quite another thing. But they could not have had MORE than 23 or 24 out of at least 54 members of the Pres. Ch; of St. Charles, in this "clear majority" But had it been otherwise, was there not something arbitrary in this self-will'd determination?

252 Reason 15th: We are not aware what the usage has been concerning slaves, but if they are not allowed to VOTE in ANY case, it cannot be denied that one privilege of full membership is denied them. Why sh'd it be so? We refer to Lev. 22, 11th; 1st Cor. 12-13th: Gal. 3-28-29. But the GIST of the charge is that "their names are improperly arrayed against us." For the information of Presbytery and Synod, we carried up a list of our members; even all the white members who stood firm with the Session, in one column; and all who followed Mr. Champberlain in another column. And the colored members in a third column. As far as we are aware, those Col'd members, 8 or 10 in No., went with the Session, but we never arrayed them as voting members against H. C.-- the charge of course that they were improperly arrayed "against them" is entirely gratuitous. It shows however the degree of the feverish heat in the system.

253 Reason 16th: When the authority of Presbytery, and their commissioner who visited us, has been contemptuously sneered at by these self-willed agitating brethern, the Session need not expect to escape entirely. The weighty charge against the Session is simply disrobodiance of our "self-moved" self contributed marters. After the Rev. H. C. made his new Elders, we concluded to complain to Presbytery: and that we might know exactly how the members stood affected; two members of Session went round, and got all the members friendly to the Session, and opposed to Mr. Chamberlain & his new Eldership, to subscribe their names. We did not see all the members: but we HAD A RIGHT to see them all, and to advise and caution them all. And who is H. C. & his Session, that we sh'd give an account to HIM? or that HE should come amongst us to trouble and disturb us? The pitiful and false epithet "DISSEIDENT" & the charge of using unlawful means &c, may pass for what they are worth. It is an old saying "The Greatest rogue is always the first to cry out thief! thief!" --- The Session are not afraid to meet all the charges of foul deeds that can be laid against them. After abusing us in every way, and finally deciding that we have no legal standing in any shape: in their overflowing compassion and complacency, they earnestly request, nay ENTREAT the Gen'l Assembly, to recommend or direct the lower Judicatory to organize the opposing party into a new church," &c. We are not able to say whether we should charge this to impudence or folly--kindness or cunning--or what to ascribe it to. What! organize US into a NEW church? Not quite so fast gentlemen. We were regularly organized perhaps before some of our pretended patrons had left the Green Mountains; and have had a visible and ecclesiastical standing ever since/ It is true a baleful wandering star with his satellites, has entered our orbit, and caused very considerable aberations and confusion. We trust however, he has now past his PERIHELION; when all his deleterious influences will cease from us.--

List of the Members Names  
who remained with the Session

List of Members names who  
followed H. Chamberlain.

- 254
1. James Lindsay Sen.
  2. Charlotte L., his wife
  3. Thomas P. Copes
  4. Sam'l S. Watson.
  5. Mrs. Mary Watson
  6. Margaret Baldrige
  7. Thos Lindsay, Jun.
  8. Margaret L. his wife
  9. James Lindsay, Jun.
  - 10 John H. Stewart
  - 11 Ann, his wife
  12. James H. Black
  13. Thomas Lindsay, Sen.
  - 14 Ann G. Durfee
  - 15 Rebecca Koonts
  - 16 Agnes Lindsay A
  - 17 Isabell Lindsay
  - 18 Sarah Griffin
  - 19 Elisha H. Jordan
  - 20 Ann, his wife
  - 21 Celia A. French
  - 22 Salina French
  - 23 Geo. C. Sibley
  - 24 Mary, his wife
  - 25 Elam S. Mc Guire
  - 26 Mary C. Griffin #
  - 27 Harriet White #
  - 28 Elizabeth White #
  - 29 Mary A. White
  - 30 Mrs. Amey Garvin #
  - 31 Miss Mary Watson \*
  - 32 Pamela Garvin #
  - 33 Sinao Simonds, free mulatto
- # These left Mr. C. in June '35  
\* Left Mr. C. in '36

- 1 Philomela Emmons
  - 2 Pleasant Cayce
  3. Jenetta Cayce
  4. Wm. Robt. Spencer.
  5. A. B. Campbell
  6. Benjamin R. Wardlaw.
  7. Eliab Jenkins.
  8. J. A. Mc Knight.
  9. Robt. A. Cummins
  - 10 H. H. Wardlaw (a)
  - 11 Mrs. Ann Wardlaw
  - 12 Mary C. Wardlaw.
  - 13 Robert Spencer (b)
  - 14 Mrs. James Bailey
  - 15 Mrs. Margaret Graham
  - 16 Martha G. Bailey (c)
  - 17 Sally H. Bailey (c)
  - 18 Catharine C. Long
  - 19 Sally Long (d)
  - 20 John Long (d)
  - 21 Mary Cayce
  - 22 Moses B. Robbins (e)
  - 23 Mary, his wife.
  - 24 Pamela Redmon (g)
  - 25 Sally H. Wardlaw (f)
  - 26 Mrs. Lucy Redmon (g)
- a-b- Suspended in '36  
c-c-living at Dardenne  
d not an adherent of either  
e not in good standing  
f at school at Columbia  
g left Mr. C. & joined Baptists early in  
1835--her daughter Pamela moved to Troy.

255

STRIFE AND CONTROVERSY OF  
The Rev. Hiram Chamberlain ( with a lady)  
about 475.----cents!!

# #  
"Behold how great a matter a little fire kindleth."

The documents from which the following is copied, are all authentic. The facts related are all indisputable. The transaction and correspondence is by no means confidential.

There is no impropriety in presenting the affair here to the reader: for it is illustrative of a very peculiar trait in Mr. Chamberlain's character and turn of

mind. I have good reason to believe that the Rev. Gentleman really considered HIS part in the transaction not only unexceptionalable, but rather meritorious in having so adroitly and cleverly defended his purse against the demand made upon it. If he is correct in this, he ought to have full credit allowed him-- Let the reader judge.

G. C. S.

###

256 Mr. Nelson to Mrs. Sibley---- 26th Novem. 1838.

\*\*\*\*\*I wrote to Mr. Chamberlain a few days before Doctor N. left; and rec'd his answer as to paying over to you what he owes me; that one reason he could not pay it, was that he had no communication with you--- About as powerful reasoning I thought, as a little child's "BECAUSE".--

I will subjoin a few lines to him; and hope that you will be kind enough to see that he gets them; which you can do either thro' friends, or by putting in the post office, after giving it a cover & direction. You will much oblige by attending to this request. As it is not probable that he has a correspondent near, or in Quincy, when he would see the post mark I do not think that he would open it. Whether thro' pique or inadvertence I know nor care not, but in his direction he omitted the MRS., altho' I wrote him quite politely. It was, however, certainly the first letter I have ever received wanting in that most common civility-- Dear Madam, by attending to this little matter, you will still further confer additional favour on your already very much obliged friend.

A. F. D. Nelson.

257 The following is a copy of Mrs. Nelson's letter to Mr. Chamberlain, to which she alluded, and which was appended to her letter to Mrs. Sibley, part of which is copied above. And subjoined will be found the correspondence that subsequently grew out of the affair; owing entirely to the perverseness of Mr. C., could this have been anticipated by G. C. S. he would much rather have paid the money at once, than to have been thus involved with the Rev.'d Gentleman, in SUCH a controversy-- ( Note: The money claimed by Mrs. Nelson was loaned to Mrs. Chamberlain about five years ago.)-

\* \* \* \* \*

Missouri Institute, Ills.

"Mr. Chamberlain:

I received your letter wherein you state that you have no communication with Mrs. Sibley, &c., as a reason why you should not settle the small sum you so justly owe me. I cannot think it an insurmountable objection, as Mrs. Sibley knew of the circumstances last summer, and of my intended application to you; consequently would understand it without any interview. You think it was settled when you settled the affairs of the Marion College. I cannot see what connection there was between Marion College and private transactions, between Mrs. C. and myself. She had made repeated application to others for money & I believe could not have obtained it in the neighborhood had I not from my VERY SLENDER MEANS, advanced it ( Doctor Nelson being absent )--but she was in distress, and gave me reiterated assurances that it should be returned; To these were added your VOLUNTARY WRITTEN communications that you would refund the money.

258

You certainly THEN (altho' it was AFTER your return ) did not consider MY PRIVATE purse as belonging to Marion College. Moreover, perhaps your memory is treacherous as to the sum in question being settled there, as Doctor Nelson knew of my writing to you lately--but if it were, I see not how it could be without my consent. I shall ask Mr. Muldrow the first opportunity, tho' it cannot alter the case.



The VERY SMALL sum in question, which impartial justice would award as MINE; will neither make you much richer, or I much poorer. But shillings, and even pennies, will often discover where honourable principles exist, and where it is wanting, as much and as plainly as thousands of silver and gold.--26th Nov.

A. F. D. NELSON.

\* \* \*

259

Linden Wood, Dec. 11th, 1838

Rev. Hiram Chamberlain.-- Sir-- Mrs. Sibley received a letter last night from Mrs. Nelson, ( wife of Rev. David Nelson of Quincy, Ill.) in which was enclosed the note from that lady to you, which you will find herewith. As Mrs. Nelson desires Mrs. Sibley to cause her note to be safely conveyed to you, and as I am, the proper agent of Mrs. S. and willing to serve all the parties in this little matter, yourself included, I have ADOPTED THIS mode of doing it; that I may use the occasion to obviate any difficulty or embarrassment that may hitherto have prevented you from discharging the trifling amount that you owe to Mrs. Nelson.--- With this view, I now propose to you, that you deposite with Mr. Stocklager the sum due to that lady ( neither Mrs. Sibley or I know the am't claimed ) in case you mean to pay it; to be by him paid over to Mrs. S. and by her receipted for in such manner & form as you may direct.----- Sometime last summer Mrs. Nelson enclosed to her daughter, who then at Linden Wood, an order to you for her little demands, which it seems the little girl never presented to you. On her return home her mother, as I understand, wrote to you on the subject, requesting you to pay the little sum due her to Mrs. Sibley; which request you refused to comply with, for the reason alluded to in Mrs. Nelson's SECOND note to you herewith enclosed. As Mrs. Sibley intends to write Mrs. Nelson, I am desired to request your immediate answer to Mrs. N's note; which I ask you to leave with Mr. Stocklager; of whom I shall make enquiry between this time and next Saturday.

With due respect, &c.

G. C. SIBLEY.

\* \* \* \* \*

260

I called on Mr. Stocklager on Monday following the date of the above note ( it being inconvenient to call on Saturday ) who informed me that he had not seen, or had any direct communication with Mr. Chamberlain on the subject referred to; but that he had been authorised, whenever the am't due to Mrs. N. should be made known to him, to pay the money claimed. I did not enquire WHO had authorised this; but supposed that Mr. Chamberlain had so directed, tho' he, Mr. C., had not even acknowledged my note of the 11th. I told Mr. Stocklager that neither I or Mrs. Sibley knew the amount claimed. That all the agency we had in the affair was simply to receive and rec't for, whatever sum Mr. Chamberlain chose to pay; who I supposed ought to know all about it. And so I left it.-----

261

Mrs. Sibley wrote soon after to her friend Mrs. Nelson and informed her of the above new difficulty. And on the 9th January 1839, received the following note from Mrs. Nelson, with the request to send it to Mr. Chamberlain.

G. C. S.

January 2, 1839

Mrs. Sibley-- Dear Madam:--Yours of the 20th inst. was only received. I conceive that Mr. Chamberlain is indebted to me \$4 and 75 cents. If however, he feels disposed to be generous on the occasion ( which for several reasons I think that he ought ) he can make it \$5, which is certainly a more convenient sum. I hope, however, that he will pay it over to you immediately. Yrs. &c.

A. F. D. NELSON.

# # #

Lindenwood 10th January 1839.

Sir: In allusion to my note to you of 11th inst. and the ~~existing~~ existing difficulty in informing

262 you the precise am't claimed of you by Mrs. Nelson; Mrs. Sibley wrote to that lady on the 20th Dec. & has just received from her the note which I now enclose you and which Mrs. N. requested to be transmitted to you for your information.

Yr. Obt. Svt.,  
G. C. Sibley.

#####

Rev. H. Chamberlain--

P. S. -- In order to put an end to this small affair, of which I am tired, I shall IMMEDIATELY remit FIVE DOLLARS to Mrs. Nelson, for your credit, which you may refund me or not, as you think fit, and when it suits your convenience.

G. C. Sibley.

\* \* \* \* \*

Note: On the same day ( 10th Jan'y.) I enclosed to Mrs. Nelson a \$5 note, and requested her to receive it as from Mr. Chamberlain--this I did, because it happened to be particularly convenient for me to do so at the time ( I was making other remittances in the same direction, and the spare \$5 bill was lying on my desk before me) and I really suppose I was doing what would be acceptable to Mr. C.

G. C. S.

\* \* \* \* \*

On the 15th January I rec'd thro' the post office the following POLITE acknowledgement (without any date ) all that I ever received from Mr. C. on the subject.

263 "Mr Chamberlain has been informed, that Majori Sibley has had the goodness unsolicited, to REMIT five dollars to A. F. D. Nelson FOR HIS CREDIT, the same being money which he does not owe, and is under no moral obligation to pay. Yet deeply sensible to the favour intended, he hastens to reciprocate, by paying precisely the same amount at the post office in St. Charles, and hopes thereby to be discharged from so weighty an obligation.

"As saith the Proverb, Chapter 20, Verse 3, 'It is honor for a man to cease from STRIFE, but every fool WILL be meddling.

H. C. "

\* \* \* \* \*

Appended to the above note was the following rec't:

"1839 Jan'y 15th. Received of Hiram Chamberlain five dollars, for an c/o of Maj. "G. C. Sibley, for the use of Mrs. Nelson."

Joseph Fawcett."

\* \* \* \* \*

Within an hour after this receipt, I answered Mr. Fawcett and Mr. Chamberlain as follows:

264 Mr. Fawcett-- Enclosed I return your receipt for the five dollars that you say the Rev. Hiram Chamberlain placed in your hands "for & on a/c of Major G. C. Sibley for the use of Mrs. Nelson." which receipt I found appended to a note from Mr. Chamberlain to me, just received. For reasons that I need not explain to YOU; I am obliged to decline receiving the five dollars mentioned: and must therefore request you to return the same whence you rec'd it. 15th Jan'y '39. Yr. &c.,

G. C. Sibley

#

Linden Wood, January 15, 1839.

Rev. Hiram Chamberlain:

Sir: It is with unfeigned repugnance that I allow myself to become any further involved in your PETTY STRIFE about the few dollars you owe and have so long owed my respected friend, Mrs. Nelson, as she most positively avers. But your VERY POLITE note to me of this day, in reply to mine of the 10th calls for an acknowledgement, and some further explanation: which when dispatched shall most assuredly conclude FINALLY my "MEDDLING" in the matter.--

265 In my note to you of the 11th Dec., I explained why I thought it proper for me to tender my agency and suggested a plain course that was intended to put an end to the strife. In conformity with that suggestion, I called upon Mr. Stockslager, who informed me that he had been authorised, and was ready to pay the money claimed, whenever the am't. should be made known to him; and I presume he would then have paid it, If I could have named the precise sum; but as I was unable to do this ( I had previously informed YOU that I did not know the amount ), the payment was obliged to be deferred 'till Mrs. Sibley could obtain from Mrs. Nelson the information required,-- that information I communicated to you on the 10th Inst. at the same time advising you of my intention to close the business by IMMEDIATELY remitting FIVE DOLLARS for your credit to Mrs. Nelson; which remittance I DID make on the same day. And I supposed that at some convenient time you would refund the money thus advanced, thro' Mr. Stockslager, in conformity with what he told me he was authorised to do in the premises. --- Until I received your note of this date, it never once entered my mind that you would any further contend with the Lady about this trifle, I had concluded and still think reasonably, that you received her note of the 26th Novemb., WHICH I SENT YOU, BY HER REQUEST, on the 11th Dec. And in this I was the more fully confirmed by what Mr. Stockslager told me, as related above. If I had not felt fully assured that you recognised the claim. as just, and intended to pay it, I should not have taken the liberty (otherwise inexcusable either to Mrs. Nelson or yourself ) of paying the money for you before hearing from you again. But as I entertained no shadow of doubt on the subject, and found it exactly convenient at the moment, to send the money to Mrs. Nelson, I concluded to do so, for the particular reason assigned in my note to you. Mrs. Nelson has probably ere this received the remittance, and doubtless rec'd it under the, mistaken, impression that it was paid by you, as in discharge of an acknowledged debt to her.--

266 I confess, Sir, that I owe apologies to Mrs. Nelson and yourself, for the liberty I have taken; and hope that the explanation here given, may in some measure excuse me, as far as YOU are concerned. I shall explain my mistake promptly, and in the most direct manner; and promise YOU, SIR, that I will never again be guilty of a like indiscretion, in any pecuniary matter which you may be concerned or interested in, if known to me.--- As you NOW positively deny that you owe the debt, herein alluded to, or that you are under any moral obligation to pay it, and so distinctly inform me in your note of this date, in which you advise me, of your having placed five dollars in Mr. Fawcett's hands to my ad't., for the use of Mrs. Nelson; I must, without delay, inform you, Sir, that ~~how~~ you have entirely mistaken your way, if you really suppose that I will receive your five dollars under such circumstances. Altho' I have no doubt of the perfect justness of Mrs. Nelson's claim; still, AS YOU DENY IT, I pretend no right to decide the matter between you. Nor do I mean to rest under any pecuniary obligation to you. If I have FOOLISHLY supposed that you MIGHT be actuated by generous and just, and gentlemanly feelings; and without further strife or denial for the lady's DEMAND, even if you had some doubts as to your moral obligation to pay it; justice demands very plainly that I should suffer the consequences and penalty of my MISTAKE and most EGREGIOUS FOLLY; and I humbly submit so to suffer. And I feel perfectly

268 sure, Sir, that you expected this result, for you had no reason whatever, to suppose that I would receive your money after your formal denial of the debt. As the matter now stands, "it might strike some minds" that you had practised a "YANKEE TRICK." upon my credulity. That finding I had paid your debt, you seized the occasion to shuffle it off on me, by an unqualified denial of its justness; knowing that, under the circumstances, I could not with honour suffer you to refund me the am't paid.

AS OF COURSE, I have desired Mr. Fawcett to return your money to you immediately. And thus I leave it for you to adjust and settle with Mrs. Nelson, the question of your indebtedness, and with your own conscience, when and how it may suit your own ideas of moral obligation and justice.

As I do not think it proper on such light occasions as this to be bandying quotations from the sacred volume; I shall content myself in reference to the proverb quoted in your last note, with this remark:-- That if YOU in HONOUR had CEASED from YOUR STRIFE with my excellent friend, Mrs. Nelson, I, IN FOOLISHNESS would have had no occasion for MEDDLING in her behalf.

Yr. Obt. Svt.

G. C. Sibley.

\* \* \* \*

269

Fulton Place Jan. 18th, 1839

Major G. C. Sibley.

(A) Sir:-- For many months I have continued to receive through the post office, many written communications from you, which seemed designed to answer no other end, than to gratify private and personal malevolence.

(B) The importance which I have attached to the whole MASS of your manuscripts you may easily learn from the silence with which they have been treated; until I penned the recent note to you of about TWELVE lines.--

(C) When I wrote that note, I verily believed that this sort of annoyance, ought in all reason and justice to CEASE.-- And further, that I ought to impart at least ONE modest hint for that end, -- that the time had at length come for me to answer. For this it is written "Answer not a fool according to his folly, lest thou also be like unto them"---"Answer a fool according to his folly, lest he be wise in his own conceit."--

(D) I DESIGN NO IMPEACHMENT OF YOUR INTELLECTS; But you really seem to be foolishly bent on mischief. How could I think otherwise? For what right has a stranger, in the state of hostility to interfere in the private affairs of any man? -- what right has he to be MEDDLING and settling his accounts? Surely the terms of non-intercourse existing between US forbid it---there are liberties which belong only to the most intimate friendships.

(E) Now I have ever held you as a stranger. I still hold you so. I know of no rule among men, which authorises you, year after year, to pour your abusive manuscripts into my private dwelling. I have intended, and I do now intend, to close the door through which you have hitherto been disposed to enter for purposes of STRIFE?

(F) If I have ever done you the slightest injustice, pray, heaven to ~~assist~~ forgive me, I am not conscious of any such design. And further, should your feelings toward me, ever so far change as to induce you to write me a civil letter on a civil subject for a civil purpose, such a letter shall receive a prompt and civil answer, as I am able to bestow.

271 (G) But untill such change takes place in you, I must REQUEST that you CEASE writing to me on any subject, and under any pretext whatever. And I do hereby most respectfully but earnestly INSIST that while life lasts you will never again presume, with unkind purpose, to write anything to me. If this my last REQUEST is disregarded, I shall take effectual measures to prevent your paper from reaching me through the same channel, the post office.

Yr. Obt. Svt.,

H. Chamberlain.

The letter of which the foregoing is an EXACT copy was received on the 19th, the day after it is dated.

I presume it must have been elicited by the reception of mine of the 15th, tho' there is not a word therein touching the particular subject of MY note or that of the correspondence so uselessly and provokingly protracted by Mr. C's obstinate perversity.

272 This last production of the Rev. gentleman's is exactly FRAMED, and doubtless was DESIGNED, to forestall and mislead the minds of certain individuals of his own party, who might perchance hear of his conduct towards Mrs. Nelson, &c., It was intended as a sort of "TUB TO THE WHALE", to divert the attention of his adherents from the convicted littleness, not to say meanness, of his course in reference to the claim of Mrs. Nelson. In case that affair should ever be publically divulged. I think I may very fairly make this inference, from the fact of Mr. Chamberlain having read his letter to Mrs. Platt, a lady of his party, who told me that he had done so previously to sending it to me; accompanied with such comments as were well calculated to leave the impression on her mind, that I have for "many months" and "year after year" been pouring into his private dwelling "MANY written communications" wantonly and wickedly designed for no other purpose, "Than to gratify private and personal lalevolence."--that I had even so far lost sight of all sense of propriety, as to allow myself to INTERFERE with his private affairs, nay even to interfere in settling his private accounts; and that he was at length compelled to put a stop to my intolerable persecution and annoyance, by means of the inderdicts contained in his LAST letter to me.

273 Such was the information voluntarily given to me from the mouth of Mrs. Platt; and it surely is not unreasonable to suppose that Mr. C. made the like communication to others. It should here be noted that in all Mr. C's verbal comments to Mrs. Platt, not one word or expression escaped him touching Mrs. Nelson's demand, &c., and it will be seen that his letter to me, which Mrs. P. says he read to her, studiously avoids any allusion to that subject that could be understood by any stranger to it.

Mr. Chamberlain knew perfectly well, when he BERNED this artfully contrived note; that he could neither deceive or edify me by it--he was conscious that the whole production was essentially a LIE, and that it was in my power to prove it so at any time that I might think fit to do it. But he knew that I had determined to notice him no further ( for I had so written him ) and he knew also that even if I should be provoked to reply, and circulate it among his friends and adherents, the START would afford him at least some TEMPORARY advantage; for the reason that TRUTH usually travels at a much SLOWER ( tho( surer ) gait than FALSEHOOD among men;

"On eagles' wings immortal scandals fly,

White, noble actions are but born and die."

274 It therefore became a prime and pressing object with this unhappy man, to represent me in an adious light before his friends, in order to forestall and if possible to counteract the effect of MY testimony, should it ever be elicited, in relation to his perverse and reproachful conduct towards Mrs. Nelson and myself. If Mr. Chamberlain had abstained from this his last subterfuge, intended as much to discredit me, and the foregoing facts; as to build up his own credit. This whole transaction in relation to Mrs. Nelson's claim against him with all that is connected with it to the 15th of January inclusive; would have been buried in oblivion as far as I am concerned. And I regret exceedingly the obligation that, as it seems to me, now urges me to copy out in proper order the whole correspondence, explanatory notes, &c., connected with the subject; and to superadd here such comments as I deem consistent with propriety and the truth, touching some of the extraordinary assertions and INNUENDOS contained in Mr. C's. last note of the 18th January.

A--- Except my **MEDDLING** in the settlement of Mrs. Nelson's claim, which will be particularly noticed presently. I never in all my life wrote to the Rev. Hiram Chamberlain, directly or indirectly, **BUT TWICE**, to each of which I received from him a civil answer. The **FIRST** was a few lines early in 1837, at the request of Mr. G. W. Herr, of St. Louis, relating to Mr. C's indebtedness to Marion College, to which he returned me a prompt and polite answer. The **SECOND** was my note to  
 275 him of the 1st. Nove. 1837 (copy of which is in this volume ) to advise him of my intention to reply to his printed pamphlet of July '37, in which he treats me **BEFORE THE PUBLIC** with a marked severity. In this note I gave him notice, that if in reviewing the subject of controversy I should find any errors of fact or argument, that he might expect me **TO COMMUNICATE THEM TO HIM DIRECT**. At the same time requesting an explanation from him of a particular passage in his pamphlet ( page 8 ) touching certain proceedings in the General Assembly, &c. To this note, I also received a prompt and civil answer.

My reply to Mr. Chamberlain's publication of July 1837, I chose to conduct in the form of letters addressed, and sent, directly to him. This mode, I adopted purposely to avoid the possibility of his charging me ( as he had done in reference to my "**NARRATIVE**" ) with a surreptitious circulation of my answer. My purpose was to send him the original Mass. of my several letters, as fast as they were written, and I could copy them for the press: for my first intention I subsequently abandoned however, for good and sufficient reasons, as I believe.

Thus it will be seen that Mr. Chamberlain's complaint about my "pouring" into  
 276 his "**PRIVATE DWELLING**" for "Many months" and "from year to year" my "Abusive manuscripts" &c., has no just pretence whatever, unless it is afforded by Mrs. Nelson's affair, or by my letters in reply to his abusive pamphlet.

As to the first, my note in behalf of Mrs. Nelson's ( only **THREE** in all; and "all "poured in" within a little over a months time.† Surely Mr. C. can find no reasonable ground for complaint--two of the three, he recognised as "**CIVIL** letters" on a civil subject, for a "**CIVIL PURPOSE**", and were by his own rule entitled to a civil answer, which, by the way, he never gave.

My third note ( of 15th Jan'y. ) stands on the record in juxtaposition with that of Mr. Chamberlain which provoked it; and to a great extent justified it as I still believe. Is it not perfectly ridiculous in Mr. C. to call my note an "**ABUSIVE MANUSCRIPT**", and to bolt and bar his doors against any more such, when compared with his own **CHASTE** and polite **PENNINGS**? Let the reader judge.--- He deliberately pens his note of the 18th, and after reading it to Mrs. Platt, **CERTAINLY**, and most **PROBABLY** to several others, with **SUITABLE** comments and Jesuitical **illustrations**, then sends it to me.

B:--- Mr. Chamberlain's effected contempt " for the whole **MASS** of my manuscripts" only proves the more conclusively, that he penned this his last letter more as a  
 277 blind to those he intended to read it to, and who might be expected **CONFIDENTALLY**, to speak of it to others; than with any expectation or wish of producing on my mind any other effect than pity and contempt for the shallow artifice. For, including his note of "about twelve lines" which he penned on or about the 15th inst: the Rev.'d Gentleman has actually noticed and answered every one of my communications to him; excepting only those written in reply to his pamphlet. Not one of which did I expect him either to answer or acknowledge, in any other manner or form than by another pamphlet. No other notice was admissable in the nature of the case. Whether he will ever attempt such answer, will probably depend very much upon **MY** publishing my reply ( contained in five letters found herein.† ) which I certainly have no intention to do, as Mr. C. has been expressly apprised of long ago. It is proper here to remark to the reader that Mr. Chamberlain had no right whatever to scold about my letters being sent to him in reply to his pamphlet; for they were communicated to him in a spirit of courtesy and candor, that deserved anything at  
 278 his hands than abuse and denunciation. It is true that those "communications" may contain some expositions not very palatable to the Rev.'d Gentleman; But if I had chosen to address them to him, thro' the **PRESS** instead of the Post office;

and had sent them forth to the PUBLIC ( after his own example ) instead of "pouring them into his private dwelling) they might have proved even more ANNOYING to him than they did. And Mr. C. cannot be so very silly or so arrogant, as to deny my perfect right to answer his attacks upon me, and the truth of my "narrative," in some way or other. And if it suits my convenience best to administer my antidote to his poison in "BROKEN DOSES", I will still insist on the right to do so; Mr. Chamberlain's complaints and interdictions to the contrary notwithstanding. It so happens in this instance; that I had entirely accomplished my reply to Mr. C's. pamphlet, and so notified him, more than six months previously to his DECREE of interdiction.

C:--Whilst the Rev. Gentleman lectures me for INCIVILITY, he even scruples not to prevent the Scriptures to VENT upon me his ABUSIVE spleen.

279 D:--This is to be sure, a very SAGE and sound argument indeed. Because Mr. Chamberlain and I are, as he has it, "Strangers" in a state of hostility ( of which facts, by the way, I was not before aware.) I am, THEREFORE, disqualified from, and forbidden to have any business intercourse with him, even in behalf of an absent friend who asks my aid. If he wrongs or hurts my friend, I forsooth may not interfere upon that friend's solicitation; lest this sensitive gentleman should be ANNOYED, and call it MEDDLING. And if in spite of his REFINED notions, I SHOULD interfere, he uses this for a pretext for refusing justice to one who had befriended him in his needs; tho' he knows that I only act by the particular request of his benefactor ( Query: Suppose Mrs. Nelson had requested my agency in PAYING to Mr. Chamberlain a sum of money for her; does any one believe that any difficulty would arise on the pretense that I am a "stranger in a state of hostility" to Mr. C. and that he would refuse to receive payment from my hands?)

280 This reasoning, if it can be called so, is supremely ridiculous. Did not Mr. C. recognise my agency when he authorised Mr. Stockslager to settle with me? How then was I meddling? How was I "interfering in his private affairs" or "meddling in settling his accounts." No farther certainly, than he himself had authorised. When I simply informed him that a friend had requested me to receive from him a debt, and I requested for the sole convenience and accomodation of Mr. C. that he pay the money to a third person ( a friend and adherent of his ), which is a summary of the facts; what truth or propriety is there in the assertion that I was MEDDLING, and the INSINUATION that I have presumed to interfere in his private affairs? This impudent barefaced, dishonest sort of lying is wholly inexcusable in Mr. C. But he was FENNING that letter not for me, so much as for influencing others. Well did he know that whosoever else might be deceived by SUCH arguments ( against plain facts ) me he could not.

281 E:-- And so, because the Rev. Mr. Chamberlain chooses to consider me as a stranger, I may not reply to his public abuse of me, lest it should ANNOY him. After he has been fomenting strife in this community, IN the church, and OUT of the church, for years past; I am to be charged BY HIM, with a disposition, a propensity for STRIFE and MISCHIEF; because I PRIVATELY reply to his wanton and unwarrantable PUBLIC attacks on me.

Mr. C.'s rule of action seems to be, to indulge himself without restraint, in coarse abuse of others who offend him; and then "to close the door" against any answer or resistance, and shut himself up in his "private dwelling", and pretends to know of no other rule among men. All this is sheer impudence and arrogance that any other man would be ashamed of.

F:--Whether my feelings toward Mr. Chamberlain will ever undergo any change in his favour or not. I trust I am incapable of wanton studied incivility to him or any other person. If provoked to it, I may answer with some severity; but I am not conscious of ever having yet indulged in any UNJUST severity towards Mr. C. In every instance in which I have even bordered on asperity towards him; I have been

provoked by his PREVIOUS vulgar abuse of me. My feelings of OPPOSITION to this unfortunate man are confined to his official character, or rather to his official conduct, as I have before explained repeatedly. This opposition does not amount to HOSTILITY, in the sense used by Mr. C. with him "opposition" and "hostility" are synonymous terms and "HOSTILITY" implies enmity & hatred. I do not so understand or apply those words agreeable to Mr. C's standard as he manifests it every day by his course and actions. I oppose him in his views and proceedings in reference to church interests and Presbyterian principles. I oppose his views of moral honesty and obligation; and find myself "in a state of hostility" to all those views, and to Mr. Chamberlain and all others, who maintain and act in accordance with such views. And yet, I should greatly wrong myself by the admission that I feel myself at ENMITY with such persons individually--that I harbour feelings of HATRED towards them. It is altogether true however, that Mr. Chamberlain's whole character and disposition must undergo a radical and entire change, before mine can assimilate or fraternize with it. Yet I am not able to perceive, in myself, any the least reason why any matter of BUSINESS of MEUM and TUUM, may not be transacted between us, should occasion require it, with perfect satisfaction and facility.

282  
283 G:--The various interdicts announced in this most extraordinary production of Mr. Chamberlain's pen, are as amusing as they are ridiculous.-- they forcibly remind me of the case of an unlucky wight, who for his low and vulgar style of abuse pruned out upon a gentleman, was unceremoniously kicked out of the house, and forbidden to enter there again. After he had recovered his perpendicular, he turned round and solemnly warned the gentleman that no further intercourse should take place between them; and as he turned to go his way, he raised his voice and his fingers in threatening tone and attitude, and with much emphasis gave notice to the gentleman ( calling witnesses to hear him ) that if he ever presumed, while life lasted, to enter HIS private dwelling, directly or indirectly, in person; by servant or written communication, he should use effectual means to prevent it; for said he, "I am determined to hold you as a stranger, and cease all intercourse with you."

284 The reader will please to recollect that I had already informed Mr. Chamberlain in my note of the 15th that our correspondence must cease in relation to Mrs. Nelson's affair; and there was certainly no reason whatever to anticipate any other occasion for my writing to him, or him to me.

I had completed all that I intended to send him in reply to his pamphlet, and under date of the 1st June last, had taken as I then hoped, my final leave of him; conformably with the following declaration, copied from my letter of the 17th February 1838, to which the reader may refer. ----- "After I shall have vindicated my church history from your cross-examination, and presented you a fair opportunity and motive to correctt the error of fact and argument, that I am fully prepared to prove do abound in your last pamphlet, I trust it may never again fall to my lot to be brought into collision with you in any manner whatever."

285 Thus it appears that Mr. Chamberlain's interdicts, are rather late in the day, and wholly gratuitous.----- When I (very civilly I am sure) complied with Mrs. Nelson's request to Mrs. Sibley, to transmit her note of 26th Nov. to Mr. C. and took occasion to suggest to him how he might very conveniently make the payment without any collision or direct personal intercourse with Mrs. Sibley or myself thus removing the only difficulty that Mr. C's. strange sensitiveness, real or affected, seemed to stand in the way; it might have been deemed a very mistaken notion, if any one had supposed it possible that SUCH A POTTER could have been produced out of so plain and simple a matter of business. I could not doubt for one moment, his full acknowledgement of the debt: after he had directed his friend to pay it. And I do not now believe he ever would have denied it, if I had called on his friend and got the money, as I ought to have done, instead of advancing it as I did.



If he HAD then denied it, Mr. Stockslager would have held him accountable.

To conclude the subject, It is very evident that Mr. Chamberlain DID owe the debt as claimed; and that he confessed it when he authorised his friend Stockslager to pay it. Tho' he afterwards deliberately and unequivocally denied it to me. If he had been actuated by just and gentlemanly principles, he would have caused the money to be paid PROMPTLY and THANKFULLY, upon Mrs. Nelson's first application. His paltry excuse that he could not pay it to Mrs. Sibley is absolutely mean and trifling; for if he was AFRAID to have paid it to her in person; he could very easily have SENT it to her. Or he could have deposited it with the postmaster ( as he subsequently pretended ) or he might have sent it at once to Mrs. Nelson, which was in fact his proper course. In short, if Mr. C. had been at all inclined to do what was right in the premises, there was nothing whatever, existing to prevent it, with proper acknowledgments.

But he resisted to the last--himself throwing obstacles in the way, and finally denying the debt, after he knew that I had paid it for him.

Really the 4.75 cent affair, tho' the cause and the occasion of all this WRITING and POETRY, is too contemptible in itself. Yet as Mrs. Nelson says very justly, "Shillings and even pennies, will often discover where honorable principle exists, and where it is wanting, as much and as plainly as thousands "of silver and gold."

"Behold how great a matter a little fire kindleth."

Readers - History informs us that two nations once went to war, and continued several years to destroy each other, upon a petty quarrel about an old well bucket---- ecce signum

GE C. SIBLEY.

24th January 1839.

287 N O T E: The foregoing from the 225th page, may appear at first view, to be out of place in this History, as having no proper connection with the Church of St. Charles. And so it would be, but for the fact that Mr. Chamberlain himself in his note of the 18th January ( page 269 ) contrives to connect the affair with his church quarrel, by reading his said note to Mrs. Platt, and then probably, with his unfair comments, etc., See pages 272,3,4.

My last letter of the review of his pamphlet, is dated 1st Jun '38 - his last note to me 18th Jan'y '39. Now inasmuch as his last note can have no proper allusion to Mrs. Nelson's affair, for he STUDIOUSLY avoids any mention of it, either in his note, or to Mrs. Platt, his intention doubtless must have been to give ME to understand that he did not relish my review, and that his note was intended in fact; and so I considered it, as his acknowledgment of the receipt of my review, and his reply to it. Thus endeavouring by his expression of contempt, meant for Mrs. Platt and others, certainly not for me, to put a false face on both Mrs. Nelson's affair & the review, and adroitly connecting them as part of his pretended wrongs rec'd at the hands of our church: concealing unfairly from his friends to whom he read his note, that the MANUSCRIPTS he affects to complain of, contained nothing more than my review of his pamphlet, and notes about Mrs. Nelson's claim; neither of which he explained - and knowing that I did not intend to publish any of either. 24th June '49 G. C. S.

THE HISTORY  
OF THE CONNECTION AND  
DISCONNECTION OF  
THE REV'D JAMES GALLAHER WITH  
THE  
FIRST PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH  
OF SAINT CHARLES, MISSOURI.

---

COMPRISING THE TIME BETWEEN

The 12th day of June 1838, and  
The 29th day of April 1840.

---

Correctly copied from the original Record  
on file in the archives of the Church.

289

At a meeting duly appointed and notified, of members of the First Presbyterian Church of St. Charles, held on the evening of the 13th June, A. D. 1838 in their church on the Hill, the following persons ( members of said church in full communion ) were present.

- |                             |                         |
|-----------------------------|-------------------------|
| 1. Sam'l Watson, Elder      | 14. Wm. B. Ferguson     |
| 2. Thos. P. Copes, Deacon   | 15. D. W. Ferguson      |
| 3. Elisha H. Jordan, Deacon | 16. Ann G. Durfee       |
| 4. Robert Boal              | 17. Selina French       |
| 5. Wm. S. Boal              | 18. Margaret Lindsay    |
| 6. Geo. C. Sibley           | 19. Ann Stuart          |
| 7. Thos. Lindsay, Jun.      | 20. Emma Garvin         |
| 8. Isaac A. Boal            | 21. Mary E. Sibley      |
| 9. Theophilus Wilson        | 22. Julia Grisham       |
| 10. E. S. Mc Guire          | 23. Isabella Lindsay    |
| 11. I. I. Sheppard          | 24. Agnes Lindsay       |
| 12. John H. Stuart          | 25. Mary Ann White      |
| 13. Jas. Lindsay, Jun.      | 26. Harriet White and   |
|                             | 27. James Lindsay, Sen. |

290

Mr. S. S. Watson was called to the chair ( there being no minister present ) and Mr. G. C. Sibley appointed clerk. The business of the meeting was opened by the chairman with prayer - - - It was then unanimously R solved: That the meeting proceed forthwith to the election of a pastor by ballôt - And upon examining and counting the ballots it appeared that all the members present had voted; and that the whole of the votes ( twenty seven ) were cast for the Rev.'d James Gallaher, to be Pastor of this church, who was thereupon declared to be duly elected to that office.

And then, on motion it was RESOLVED unanimously, to prosecute this call by a committee, agreeable to the provision of the 7th Act of the 15th Ch: of our form of Government. And Robt. Boal & G. C. Sibley were thereupon appointed that committee, with Special instruction also, to open and circulate a subscription book for the purpose of support of Mr. Gallaher, and to pledge to him, in behalf of the church, such sum as they may thereby secure for that object.

And then, on motion, it was further RESOLVED, to choose at this time, one additional Elder for this church. And the meeting proceeded forthwith, in the election. On counting the Ballots it appeared that there were TWENTY FIVE for Robert Boal; one for James Lindsay Sen. and ONE for Wm. S. Boal. Robert Boal was therefore declared duly elected a Ruling Elder in said church. -- and then the meeting adjourned.

Signed S. S. WATSON, CHAIRMAN  
G. C. SIBLEY, CLK.

291

In conformity with the 2nd Resolution passed at the meeting ( of the 13th Jun '38 ) Rob't Boal & G. C. Sibley, the committee appointed for the purpose, did on the 18th day of the same month, open and circulate a subscription, and obtained thereon, subscriptions amounting to \$684 dollars. The subscription is in the following words, to wit:

"We, the Subscribers hereby promise to pay unto Elisha H. Jordan one of the Deacons of the Presbyterian Church of St. Charles, or to such other person as may be duly appointed to receive the same, the sum that we have set opposite our signatures, respectively, in this Book; for the purpose of supporting for one year, the Rev. James Gallaher as Pastor of said church and congregation; from the date of his entrance upon his pastoral duties. One half of which sum to be paid in six months from such entrance, and the other half at the Expiration of the year, or in proportions for any shorter time.-- St. Charles, June 18th, 1838

## SUBSCRIBERS' NAMES

## SUMS SUBSCRIBED.

	Thomas Lindsay	Fifty dollars
	Thomas P. Copes	One hundred dollars
	Geo. C. Sibley	One hundred dollars
292	Ann G. Durfee	Fifteen dollars
	Robt. Boal	One hundred dollars
	Jas. Lindsay, Jun.	Twenty five dollars.
	Jas. Lindsay, Sen.	Fifteen Dollars.
	Agnes Lindsay	Five Dollars
	Isabella Lindsay	Five Dollars
	John H. Stuart	<del>Five</del> Ten Dollars
	Thos. Lindsay, Jun.	Fifteen dollars.
	S. S. Watson	Fifty dollars
	Mary A. Watson	Ten Dollars
	Amey Garvin	Ten Dollars
	Eunice D. Rosseter	Twenty-five Dollars
	Mary Ferguson	Ten Dollars
	Prera House by Wm. S. Boal	Sixty Dollars
	Elisha H. Jordan	Forty Dollars
	P. A. Stockslager	Five Dollars
	E. Foushee	Five Dollars
	E. C. Cunningham	Five Dollars
	Benj. Emmons-	Three Dollars
	Henry Payne	Three Dollars
	Julia Grisham	Five Dollars
	Harriet White	Four Dollars
	Mary Ann White	Four Dollars

293 Very soon after the completion of the foregoing subscription Messrs. Boal and Sibley wrote to Mr. Gallaher, then residing in the Marion County, to advise him of his election and of the subscription for his support. And to urge him to visit our church as soon as convenient (it should be noted here, that Mr. Gallaher had been understood by a number of his brethren, sometime previous to the meeting in June, to have intimated, tho' somewhat vaguely, that he would come to St. Charles if desired by the church.) Mr. Gallaher paid us a visit early in July and preached for us.

It soon happened, that as the same time the Rev. MOSES WILLIAMSON of New Jersey came to St. Charles with the view of settling here as our Pastor should our church be still vacant, and all things suit. He preached for us once, and there was evidently a favourable impression in the church towards him (See Note A.) Of all which Mr. Gallaher was fully apprised. He was present at the church when Mr. Williamson was taking leave of us to return home; and it was observed, that as he did not say a word to encourage Mr. Williamson to prolong his stay, the inference was fair, that he had himself determined to accept our call. If there had been any doubt on this point, it is very certain that the church would have invited Mr. Williamson to remain longer with us.

294 But Mr. Gallaher did on that same day acknowledge from the pulpit, the receipt of our invitation, and INTIMATED his inclination and purpose, to accept it, whenever it should reach him thro' the prescribed forms of our Church Government - - - On the meeting of the Presbytery of St. Charles, early in October '38, the call of our church was taken up, approved, and in due form placed in Mr. Gallaher's hands, who was present. Mr. Gallaher THEN answered that he would take time to consider whether he would accept the call or not. He had now received and accepted an invitation to visit some parts of the interior of the state of Mississippi, and did immediately set out upon his journey thither; BUT WITHOUT INFORMING OUR SESSION, OR ANY MEMBERS, WHAT WERE HIS INTENTIONS IN RELATION TO OUR CALL (See Note B. page 305) A period of nearly five months elapsed from

the time of Mr. G's. departure for Mississippi 'till his return to Missouri, and not one word was heard from him during his absence, except some flying reports brought from that country by the Rev. Mr. Strong, tract agent, to the effect that Mr. Gallaher had engaged his services to several churches in Mississippi.

294

When he DID return, in, in March, visited St. Charles from Marion County, and preached frequently in our church; he still declined giving any definite answer to our call, now in his possession more than six months. Nor did he EVER, at any time up to April 1840, give any answer. If he ever did accept, or even imagine that he had, it is certain that the Session were never advised of, or knew it. On the contrary, they, as well as nearly all, if not ALL, the church & congregation considered that Mr. Gallaher had TACTICLY declined our invitation. This may be very safely infered from the fact, that the Session did upon the suggestion of several members, make enquiry for a minister to take the Pastoral charge of the church. Dr. Calhoun was earnestly invited by the Session to accept; and Mr. Strong and others, frequently spoken of by members, in the presence of the Ruling Elders.

295

During the whole period, from early in March 1839, after his return from the south, 'till early in April, 1840, Mr. Gallaher's preaching in St. Charles was extremely irregular; and if he ever even attempted to perform anything like pastoral duties among us, certain it is, that no one in this church was aware of it. More than half the time, we were beholden to other ministers, for the supply of our pulpit; exclusive of the time Mr. G. was absent in Mississippi. And yet Mr. Gallaher has claimed his salary, on our subscription, as for ministerial services rendered, AS OUR PASTOR, for FIFTEEN months, commencing on the 1st of January 1839 ( THEN and till some time in March absent ) and has actually, in consequence of his importunity, collected a large portion of it. This Mr. Gallaher has demanded and received as OUR Pastor, in the face of all the facts above stated, AND THO' HE HAD WITHIN THE SAME TIME, AN ENGAGEMENT AND SALARY AT TROY, OF WH CH THIS CHURCH AND SESSION WERE NEVER ADVISED.

296

The church and congregation had naturally become much dissatisfied with this state of things; and early in January 1840, a church meeting began to be seriously talked of; to adopt proper measures to obtain a pastor. Mr. Robert Boal, one of the Ruling Elders, at this time, set forth an enquiry to ascertain from the members individually ( without any church meeting ) which he was anxious to prevent ) their views and wishes in relation to a Pastor; and particularly as to the further employment of Mr. Gallaher. Mr. Thomas Lindsay, the Sen. Elder and Mr. Watson THE other Elder, both of the Deacons and a large portion of the old members, were desirous of a general meeting of the church, not only to decide about a Pastor, but also to ascertain and define the actual position of the church in relation to the General Assembly, as recommended to the church in Missouri by the convention that set in St. Charles, in October 1839.

It was believed that a very decided majority of the church inclined to adopt the remomendation of the convention, and that it was unwise to delay proper action on the subject any longer. ( See Note C page 306 ) Mr. Boal and some others, were avowedly opposed to any such action; and were of opinion that no church meeting ought to be held; and that any further agitation of the subject last named, was entirely useless and improper. Mr. Gallaher was also of the opinion. He and Mr. Boal used considerable exertion PERSONALLY, to dissuade the members from the course they seemed inclined to prusue; but without effect, except in a few instances ( See Note D. page 307 ).

297

During the early part of this agi tation, Mr. Boal sought occasion several times, to consult with the writer of this ( as doubtless he did with other members ) on this subject. In all such conversations he expressed his own wish, that the church should ( without the formality of any meeting ) provide for a Pastor - that Mr. Gallaher should be the Pastor; with the understanding however, that the connection should be wholly informal, and from year to year, as a sort of independent church; and to remain 'till the great Presbyterian controversy should

be FINALLY SETTLED TO OUR LIKING. The purport of this project, as the writer understood it, was this: That we should bind ourselves ( the church ) to support Mr. Gallaher upon a good salary, as our Pastor, entirely unconnected with and exempt from Presbyterian Law. To such a course there were not only decided objections, founded on long cherished principles; but there were many members (irrespective of any church PARTY views ) who were, for various OTHER reasons, much dissatisfied with Mr. Gallaher's conduct towards this church. His steady refusal to form any Presbyterian connection with us, displeased some--his itinerant propensities were objected to by others: for tho' he was generally POPULAR as an itinerant preacher; scarcely ANY one considered him at all qualified for the more important functions of a Pastor.--EXPERIENCE since October '38 to Jan'y '40 had quite convinced all of us on THAT point. Anxious to promote an amicable settlement of this growing difficulty, at the same time determined to be fairly understood in the premises; the writer of this narrative, after consulting with several other members, to know THEIR views also, thought fit to state fully, in a note to Mr. Boal, his own opinions. ( See Note. E -P. 308 )

Meanwhile, the absolute propriety of a church meeting became apparent to most of the church, and tho' postponed from time to time by the influence of Mr. Gallaher and Mr. Boal, was at length duly notified to take place on the 26th April.

The following are the official notes of the proceedings.

A T A M E E T I N G, duly appointed and notified of members of the First Presbyterian church of Saint Charles, Missouri, held on Tuesday evening the 26th day of April, A. D. 1840 in their church on the Hill, the following persons, members in full communion were present, to wit:

Rev. James Gallaher	Thos. P. Copes, Deacon
Thos. Lindsay, Sen. Elder	Elisha H. Jordan, Deacon
Sam'l S. Watson, Elder	James Lindsay, Sen.
299 Robert Boal, Elder	Ninran B. Barron
Nathan'l Reid	Mrs. Mary Ferguson
Jonathan Phillips	Mrs. Laura Ferguson
Loxly Jacobs	Mrs. Mary Glenday
Isaac A. Boal	Mrs. Adele Barron
Wm. B. Ferguson	Miss Ellis
D. W. Ferguson	Miss E. D. Rosseter.
Geo. C. Sibley	Miss Harriet White
Thos. Lindsay, Junr	Miss Sarah Boggs
James Lindsay, Junr	Miss Isabella Lindsay
Wm. Mc Dowell	Miss Eliza Gallaher
H. Gillespie	Miss Mary Gallaher
Jas. Gallaher, Junr.	Miss -- Weaver
F. R. Gallaher	Miss A. Dunnica
Mr. --- Weaver	Miss V. Sanford
Mrs. L. Gallaher	Miss Leona Hardeman
Mrs. Mary T. Lindsay	Miss Mary Thompson
Mrs. Mary A. Coalter	Miss Louisa Stribling
Mrs. Mary E. Sibley	Miss Mary Gambe
Mrs. Mary A. Watson	Miss E. Wheelock ( 46 in all )

On motion of Rev. W. Gallaher G. S. Sibley was appointed chairman, and Thos. P. Copes Secretary of the meeting. The business of the meeting was then opened by Prayer, by Rev. Mr. Gallaher, And after the particular objects of the meeting ( As previously announced ) had been stated from the chair, to wit, "To take into consideration the desire of this church to ascertain its position in relation to the General Assembly. To appoint one additional Elder. And to adopt measures to provide a regular Pastor."..... Mr. Thos. Lindsay, Sen., the Sen. Elder, rose and offered the following Resolution, and asked its adoption, to wit:

"RESOLVED: That we, the undersigned, members of the Presbyterian Church of Saint Charles, do declare it to be our purpose and decided choice, to continue members of the Presbyterian Church, under the care and direction of the ~~Presbyterian~~ General Assembly of the Presbyterian church in the United States of America, commonly called "THE OLD SCHOOL GENERAL ASSEMBLY".

Mr. Boal, an Elder, moved to postpone the consideration of said Resolution till after the meeting of Synod of Missouri in October next.

After much debate, in which Messrs. Boal and Gallaher Sen. spoke in favor of postponing; and Messrs. Lindsay, Watson, Copes and Sibley against it, the motion to postpone was rejected, -- Ayes 16, Noes 23, (7 members not voting.) Mr. Robert Boal then moved to amend the Resolution--by striking out from the concluding lines the words, "COMMONLY CALLED THE OLD SCHOOL GENERAL ASSEMBLY" which motion was rejected-- Ayes 16 -- Noes 24 (6 not voting)

301

The question then recurring on the adoption of the Resolution in its original form as offer'd by Mr. Lindsay: a warm discussion ensued between Mr. Lindsay, Watson and Sibley in affirmative; and Rev. Mr. Gallaher and Mr. Rob't Boal in the negative; and was at length decided in the affirmative--Ayes 24 --Nays 17 (5 not voting) --those who voted in the affirmative are: Thos Lindsay, Sen-Watson-Copes-Jordan-Reid-Barron-Sibley-Jacobs) T. Lindsay, Jun.- Phillips-Mrs. Watson-Mrs. Barron-Mrs. Coatter-Mrs. Glenday- Mrs. Sibley- Miss Roster- Miss Gamble-Miss Sanford- Miss Stribling-Miss Wheelock-Miss Dunica-Miss Harde-mah- and Miss Thompson.--- Those who voted in the Negative are: Rev. J. Gallaher-Rt. Boal-D. W. Ferguson-Wm. B. Ferguson-E. A. Boal-Jas. Lindsay, Sen.-Gillespie-Mc Dowell-Jas. Lindsay, Jun.--F. R. Gallaher-Weaver-J. Gallaher Jun.--Mrs. Gallaher--Miss E. Gallaher-Mr. Ellis- Miss M. Gallaher & Mrs. W. Ferguson. (not voting: Miss White, Miss Boggs, Miss Lindsay, Miss Weaver, and Mrs. Laura Ferguson) So the Resolution passed, and was subscribed, by those who voted for it.--

302

Mr. Copes offered the following Resolution, to wit: "Whereas it is expedient to appoint an additional Elder in this church--And whereas one of our members, Mr. Ninian B. Barron is an ordained Elder in the Presbyterian Church--THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED; That Mr. N. B. Barron be, and hereby is, appointed and set apart as a Ruling Elder in the First Presbyterian Church of Saint Charles," which Resolution was adopted unanimously.

Mr. Copes then offered the following. "RESOLVED that the Session of this church be authorized and requested, to take prompt measure to provide immediately a Pastor for this church; and untill a Pastor can be obtained, to provide a temporary supply for our pulpit." Which resolution was adopted, without opposition. --- Mr. Rob't. Boal then submitted the following- - "RESOLVED, that the Session be directed to give certificates of dismissal from this church, to any members who may ask them, for the purpose of forming a New Church, or to unite with other churches."

Passed without opposition or remark ( p. 357 ) The following Resolution was then offered by Mr. R't. Boal, "RESOLVED: that the sum of TWO HUNDRED DOLLARS, be raised forthwith, to compensate the Rev. James Gallaher, for his ministerial services from the 1st January last until the 1st of May. And the Deacons of the church are hereby requested to circulate a subscription as soon as practicable for this purpose." A majority of voices assented to this resolution, and it passed. Messrs. Sibley, Reid and Thos. Lindsay, Sen. expressly dissenting. (p. 351)

Mr. Boal then offered the following; "Whereas, it is probable that a portion of this church will withdraw from this communion, with a view of organising a New Church "RESOLVED, that this church will refund to any individual who may withdraw, the amount they, or any of them, may have contributed towards this church (p. 351) Opposition was made to this resolution on the grounds of its utter impropriety and inconsistency, injustice and IMPRACTICABILITY; and was finally withdrawn by the mover. - - - -On the suggestion of Mr. B't. Boal that some provision ought to be made for the present supply of the pulpit in this church: Mr. Jordan moved the

"RESOLVED-- That the Session employ the Rev. James Gallaher to preach in this church, 'till the 1st of November next."

304 The question being put on this motion, it passed--very few members voting for or against it. Mr. Thos. Lindsay, immediately moved a RECONSIDERATION, which was carried: and then the question recurring "Shall the Resolution pass?" is was strenuously opposed by Messrs. Thos. Lindsay Sen. and G. C. Sibley, as being entirely inconsistent with the previous resolves of this meeting, and with the declarations and votes of the Rev. Mr. Gallaher.

Mr. Gallaher here interposed, and requested Mr. Jordan to withdraw the Resolution, saying that it would not suit his arrangements to comply with it, if it passed. And Mr. Jordan did withdraw the Resolution accordingly. And then, after prayer, the meeting adjourned.--

GEO. C. SIBLEY, Chairman

Thos. P. Copes, Secretary.

-----  
For a sketch of the debates, etc. ( On Mr. Lindsay's resolution particularly ) See Note F-- page 324.

-----  
The following are the NOTES refered to in the preceding Record of Proceedings, &c.

305 NOTE A; See page 293

Some months previously to any thought or expectation of inviting Mr. Gallaher, the Session had opened a negotiation ( Thro' the Rev. E. Strong and the Rev. S. Scovel ) with the Rev. James Williamson to come and be our Pastor: Be he was elsewhere engaged. And thinking that his brother, the Rev. Moses Williamson, who was then at liberty, might suit us; recommended him to the Session.

This gentleman, tho' he had been AT ONCE TIME locked for, was not expected when the church elected Mr. Gallaher (13th June '38) His arrival at St. Charles in July was entirely unexpected; and tho' many regretted sincerely that he had not come before the call of Mr. Gallaher ( for he would have been greatly preferred by many of us ) yet nothing further could be said or done to retain him; inasmuch as the church considered Mr. Gallaher as engaged, and were led by him to believe, that he intended to enter immediately upon the duties of our Pastor.

-----  
NOTE B.: page 294

306 On the night before Mr. Gallaher's departure on his trip to the south. Standing in the church as the congregation was dispersing, the writer of this earnestly enquired of Mr. G. how long he expected to be absent from St. Charles? expressing his anxious wish that his stay would be very short. Mr. Gallaher answered, that his daughter's delicate health made it necessary for her to pass the coming winter farther south. That he must himself accompany her as far as Memphis; from WHENCE he expected to return immediately; and that he should probably be back here in about two or three weeks.

We were very much surprised to learn sometime after his departure, THAT MR. GALLAHER HAD, AT THE VERY TIME OF THIS CONVERSATION, already accepted of an invitation to visit Mississippi--that he had ( upon his express requisition ) acutally received from there money to defray the expenses of his trip; and that he was THEN actually on his way to fulfill his ENGAGEMENTS in the South. Al which proved to be true-- And yet Mr. Gallaher had never informed the Session, or even hinted to them, or the church, one word of this ENGAGEMENT; nor was it in the least suspected by either 'till some time after his departure.



NOTE C; page 296

307 The official Record of the proceedings of the convention, had been sought in vain by the writer himself.-- it is most probable that they are lost.

It may suffice however, to state: that the convention was numerously attended by delegates from all parts of the State, representing every Shade of opinion touching the Old and New School controversy. With but few exception ( not exceeding two or three ) the members cordially agreed to adopt a Resolution, the substance of which was; earnestly recommending to the Presbyterian churches in Missouri, to continue their adherence to the General Assembly commonly called THE OLD SCHOOL ASSEMBLY, irrespective of the controverted Acts of 1837 & 1838, known as the "Excinding" and "Test" Acts.-- Most of the churches, it is believed, promptly adopted the course recommended, as did a very large majority of ministers then in Missouri. Neither approving or condemning the said Acts, in accordance with the advice of the convention.

NOTE D: page 296.

308 Quite late on night in January 1840, Mr. Gallaher and Mr. Rob't Boal called at the residence of the writer. Mr. Copes had previously called on some matter of business, and was still present. The particular object of this visit was soon made manifest. It had for some days past, been strenuously recommended by a number of the members of the church, to have a full meeting, ( for the purpose explained in page 300 ) and the present object of those gentlemen was, to endeavor to make impressions on the mind of the writer and ~~xxxxxx~~ of two others of his family ( church members ) UNFAVOURABLE to such meeting. Messrs: Gallaher and Boal very earnestly urged their NEUTRAL PLAN, and used many arguments to recommend it; and warmly expressed their apprehensions of the "mischievous effects" of a church meeting. Mr. Gallaher said much, and with much warmth, in denunciation of church meetings in general; and said he could see no cause whatever, for the proposed meeting. The result of our discussions was, a most decided dissent on our part ( Mr. Copes concurring with us ) from the views set forth by those two brethren--AND CONVINCED US MORE CONCLUSIVELY, THAT A MEETING WAS INDESPENSIBLE.

NOTE E: page 298:

309 The note of which the following is a copy, was elicited, chiefly by the conversation mentioned in Note D, p. 296. Soon after which, it was written.

"To Mr. Robert Boal

My dear Sir:

As you have done me the honour to consult me about the propriety of some immediate action on the part of the church, in relation to a Pastor; and more particularly in relation to the Rev. James Gallaher's connection therewith; and as our several conversations on those subjects have been hasty and inconclusive, and to me unsatisfactory; I deem it proper for me to offer you my views in THIS form, lest I should be misunderstood in the meaning of any of my oral remarks to you, or in your hearing.

310 You may remember that I entered very cordially with you and others, in giving the invitation to Mr. Gallaher to be our Pastor, on the 13th June 1838; and also in procuring Subscriptions for his support. The call was given by the unanimous vote of the meeting, twenty-seven members being present. Immediately after the election, you and I, as a committee duly authorised, wrote to Mr. Gallaher, to apprise him of his election, and to urge him to visit us immediately. Mr. G. soon after came to St. Charles ( whilst the Rev. Mr. Williamson was on HIS visit here ) and did from the Pulpit, acknowledge the receipt of our invitation, and intimated his purpose to accept the call, when it should reach him through the prescribed forms; and to enter upon the engagement as soon as he could remove his family, &c.-- On the meeting of the Presbytery early in October 1838, our call came up, was approved and placed in Mr. Gallaher's hands

311

who THEN answered, that he would "TAKE TIME TO CONSIDER IT"; and immediately went down to Mississippi, from whence he did not return 'till sometime in February 1839: and during that ~~whole~~ lapse of about FIVE MONTHS, not one word was heard from Mr. G. whether he had determined to accept of our warm, earnest, and unanimous invitation or not. Soon after Mr. Gallaher's return from the South, I enquired of Mr. Lindsay and Mr. Watson, and probably of you also, what he intended to do? and was told that he had never yet given any decisive answer.

I was present LONG AFTERWARDS, when Mr. Lindsay and Mr. Watson earnestly pressed Dr. Calhoun to be our Pastor; under the impression certainly, that Mr. Gallaher had declined. In fine, Sir, I do not think that one member of the church considered Mr. Gallaher to be at all connected with it in virtue of the call of June 1838, or that the call was at all binding on the church at ANY time subsequently to his return from the south. For myself, I certainly DID not, and DO not, so consider.--

312

I have frequently expressed my chagrin and disappointment at Mr. Gallaher's want of courtesy towards us, in not answering, yea or nay, our cordial invitation for so I was compelled to consider his silence. And I have more than once expressed my impatience at the want of action on the part of Session to provide us a Pastor; or at least a stated supply, in conformity with the usual practise, and established forms of the Presbyterian Church. And I do assume you, my dear sir, that untill the declaration made by Mr. Gallaher the other night at my house, in yours and Mr. Copes hearing \* it never once occurred to me AS A THING POSSIBLE, that Mr. G. did or COULD seriously consider himself in connection with his church; otherwise than by some temporary arrangement between him and the Session.

Such have been my views, feelings and conclusions hitherto, with regard to Mr. Gallaher's connection with our church; and I have good reason to believe, that such, or very nearly such, have been the impressions of nearly every other member. Certain it is, therefore, that a great misunderstanding exists; and that Mr. Gallaher ought now, PREVIOUSLY TO ANY OTHER PROCEEDING IN HIS CASE, TO MAKE SUCH EXPLANATIONS as may be reasonably required in the premises.---

Thus much for the past. Now for the present and future-- If I rightly understand you and Mr. Gallaher, your Propositions is this. That our church be invited, WITHOUT A MEETING to

\*--The declaration here alluded to, was to the effect, that Mr. G. did claim TO HAVE BEEN, AND THEN TO BE, Pastor of our church. It was made at the time mentioned in Note D.--p. 307

313

provide by subscriptions a suitable support for Mr. G. from year to year, as Pastor, with the understanding, however, THAT THE CONNECTION SHALL BE AN INFORMAL ONE, AND NOT ACCORDING TO THE RULES PRESCRIBED BY THE DISCIPLINE OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH.-- Thus separating ourselves voluntarily from all our church Judicatories, untill the existing controversy in the church at large, shall be settled in such manner as that WE can agree to the terms.

Or in other words: That the church of St. Charles, with Mr. Gallaher for Pastor, shall for an indefinite period, retire from the Body of the Presbyterian Church, stand aloof, and assume a neutral position, as to said controversy, and thus await the action of our sister churches to bring about the desired settlement. After which, we will again, BY OUR OWN VOLITION, fall into the ranks, and resume our station as heretofore - to wit: As the Presbyterian Church of St. Charles. This I believe is the purport of the proposition, upon

upon which you have asked my opinion; and I will now proceed to give you frankly and explicitly --\* With

314 \*-- This proposition of Messrs Boal and Gallaher is here fully and fairly stated: and has been admitted to be so by Mr. Boal; and is enough of itself, to excite the surprise and apprehension of every sincere and intelligent Presbyterian in our communion. And it did in fact, eventually produce the church meeting, of April 28th, 1840, so much dreaded and opposed by Messrs. Gallaher and Boal. Our preservation as a church, and that of our house of worship, demanded the prompt action of all its old friends & supporters... G. C. S.

315 all due deference and respect for the better judgment of Mr. Gallaher and yourself in matters of this nature; I am unable to agree with you here; for I am entirely averse to the POSITION proposed; for the following and other reasons:-- FIRST, because I believe it will be equivalent to disfranchisement, and utterly destroy us as a branch of the Presbyterian Church. We should become Congregational in character, if not in name; and forfeit and lose our name and title of the "First Presbyterian Church of St. Charles," with it our rights, privileges and associations as such. SECOND-- Among the forfeitures consequent upon such a step would be our House of Worship, with the lot on which it stands; which would, according to the express condition of our title deed, vest immediately in Mr. Chamberlain's faction of our church. Such I conscientiously believe would be, AND OUGHT TO BE, the judgment of any court of law. And I am very sure that upon the occurrence of the supposed contingency, the claim would be promptly asserted. I might mention OTHER reasons; but these are quite sufficient, I think, to prove the INEXPEDIENCY of the measure suggested. It would I believe be wrong in principles, and very unwise in policy. Much therefore, as I might desire to secure Mr. Gallaher's regular services in our church; IT IS ABSOLUTELY IMPOSSIBLE FOR ME to consent to accept them at so great, and as I conceive, so unnecessary a sacrifice.

316 It really seem to me that the position now occupied by nearly all our churches and ministers in Missouri, based on the Acts of the late convention, in which this church largely participated, is wholly unobjectionable, and is well calculated to promote and secure that peace and harmony in our Missouri churches, that we so much desire and pray for. It requires no sacrifice of principles, of prejudice, or feeling, further than is consistent with Christian duty and honourable compromise. I therefore, as I cannot consent to YOUR suggestion, beg leave in MY turn to suggest the ONLY plan by which our church can, IN MY OPINION, accept of Mr. Gallaher's pastoral service. And that is briefly, this \* - - - - For him, Mr. G., PREVIOUSLY to give assurance, that he does, and will, identify himself with the agreement that lately sat in St. Charles. If Mr. Gallaher and yourself will consent to this, it will affix the seal, as it were, of our lasting union, put an end effectually to all our difficulties of a secular nature, and firmly establish the church of St. Charles in peace, harmony, and propriety. So I believe, and so I suffer myself fondly to hope. It will be impossible, I am quite sure, to introduce a Pastor into our church, let him be who he may.

\*-- When Mr. G. was elected our Pastor; and for some time after, the members generally believed him to be of the Old School party; tho' he carefully CONCEALED HIS REAL VIEWS. Some always doubted him however. It was now deemed necessary to draw aside the veil.

317 Short of such pledge, without rending us asunder, engendering strife and confusion, and scenes of bitter and wicked contention. No such attempt should be made therefore, by any means: And I am persuaded that none such will be made.

Therefore, if it can be previously ascertained that we can all act in harmony \* we ought, in my judgment, to have a church meeting immediately, if not, not. And thus, my dear sir, I have told you with perfect unreserve, my MATURE opinions about these matters. I offer them to you, upon your solicitation, for just what they are worth. And may our Heavenly Father direct us in His wisdom and mercy: keep us all together IN THE INTEGRITY OF OUR VOWS, and greatly bless us.

Yrs. in Christian friendship.

G. C. Sibley.

January 21st, 1840.##

\* What is here meant, and was well understood by "acting in harmony", is a sincere desire on the part of all the members, to counsel together in such a spirit, as to suppress and keep down all PARTY FEELING, so as to prevent dissensions and divisions.

## This letter to Mr. Boal is copied here in full, because it exhibits very clearly the views of Messrs. Boal and Gallaher, and what the writer believed to be the OPPOSITE views of other members touching the position that the church ought to assume, nearly four months before the meeting that took place in April 1840

A few days after the date of the preceding note to Mr. Boal, that Gentleman called on the writer, and verbally acknowledged its receipt. He took no exceptions to any of the facts set forth in the note, as to the strange course Mr. Mr. Gallaher had thought fit to pursue in relation to our call; nor indeed to any OTHER fact therein stated. But he entered into a long and laboured argument ~~as to the forfeiture of our church property, in the event~~ to convince the writer that that he was in error. First, as to the danger of losing our Presbyterian character and standing; and SECOND as to the forfeiture of our church property, in the event of our adopting the neutral plan, as recommended by himself and Mr. Gallaher. He urged, at large, that it was quite immaterial, so far as related to the Presbyterian character and rights, as such, of any church, whether it OWNED any actual connection with any Synod of General Assembly or not; or occupied any such position.

319 Mr. Boal claimed the experience of more than thirty years in the Presbyterian church, many of which, as a Ruling Elder. His long and close intimacy with Mr. Gallaher, gave him the benefit also of that experienced minister's counsel and advice, in whatever related to Presbyterianism, as established in the United States of America.

When therefore Mr. B. gave himself the trouble to call upon, and converse with one of such inferior pretensions, having only five years experience in the church; speaking as he did with the authority of a ruling Elder, in the church of St. Charles; and as was fair to infer, with the concurrence of Mr. Gallaher, who claimed to be the Pastor of that church; his remarks were listened to with attention, and unfeigned deference.

320 But they failed to accomplish their object. The warmth with which Mr. Boal digressed, rather unfitly, into a course of argument, advocating the "NEW SCHOOL" and condemning utterly the "OLD SCHOOL proceedings; in course of which he let fall some rather unguarded expressions touching his and Mr. Gallaher's ULTRIOR views towards our afflicted church; awakened in the mind of the writer certain very painful apprehensions, that those gentleman might have some favorite scheme of their own, inconsistent with our well de fined, and established system of Presbyterian Church pölicy; in which scheme they were endeavoring to enlist, in detail, as many and large a portion of our little church, as they possibly could, SO AS TO OBTAIN THE MAJORITY OF VOTES: in order thereby to secure FROM OUR POCKET, a good support for Mr. Gallaher's family in St. Charles, whilst Mr. G. himself might employ most of his time, as he had previously done, ITINERATING FAR AND WIDE, FOR HIS OWN

## PECUNIARY PROFIT.

Such a conclusion appeared irresistible at the time, in view of the then existing circumstances; and subsequent events have only tended to confirm it. True it is, the writer of this was well aware of the fact ( a fact completely substantiated) that the Rev. James Gallaher was in very easy, if not affluent circumstances: and could not by any means be supposed to stand in NEED of any such pecuniary support as above suggested. But he was well aware also, that the Rev'd gentleman was a VERY STRICT AND CLOSE ECONOMIST, in all that pertains to the financial regulations of his household; and that some four or five hundred dollars a year from our poor, hackled, abused little church, would not be unacceptable, or UNACCEPTED addition to his other revenues, if attainable.

321

At this time (January 1840) the church of St. Charles consisted of about SIXTY TWO members. Twenty of whom were of Mr. Gallaher's and Mr. Boal's families.--- those TWENTY and FIVE or SIX others, were known to favour the particular views of Messrs. G. & B. So that if all attended and voted, there was but a small majority against them; which it was evident they expected to be able to overcome within a few months. Hence their aversion to any church meeting, and to any immediate action on Mr. Lindsay's Resolution. -- When Mr. Boal and his family united with our Church ( 10 June 1838 ) nearly every member was then "OLD SCHOOL" in sentiment, which Mr. B. well knew at the time. Mr. Gallaher and HIS family united with us on the 16th June 1839; and soon afterwards the question as to which party might obtain the ascendancy, and rule the church began to be discussed and agitated; so that many of the OLD members became seriously apprehensive that the NEW members (The families and adherents of Messrs Gallaher and Boal) might ere long become the majority; and consequently be able to divide the church, and hold the property, if they should ever feel inclined to act, and there were not wanting significant manifestations to that effect, from time to time.

322

The Convention of October 1839, already alluded to, adopted a conciliatory plan for the settlement and tranquilising of party strife in the Missouri Churches, which it was hoped and fully expected, would be very generally accepted and acted on ( as in fact it was ) and that it would afford the church of St. Charles particularly, a fair opportunity and motive to put an end to the rising dissention. With this view a church meeting was called by the Session ( Mr. Boal dissenting ) And with this view Mr. Lindsay's Resolution was carefully drawn, and offered in a spirit of peace and harmony . For altho' opposition to the measure was anticipated to some extent, yet the DETERMINATION of Messrs. Gallaher and Boal NOT to submit to the scision of the majority if THEY were not of that majority, was for the first time made known by them at the meeting, whilst the Resolution was under consideration. Having made up their minds to pursue a course so arbitrary, and so extremely unfair and discourteous, a strict regard to propriety would have dictated to those brethren, either to have absented themselves, or abstained from taking ANY part, much less a LEADING part, in the meeting. It was impossible however, even with the warning THEN announced; for the friends of the resolution ( the ascertained majority) to FLINCH from their plain duty, without disgrace and ultimate defeat. The trial was indeed severe; but the triumph of principles was signal and complete. And never has the majority had occasion since, to regret their firmness and decision.

323

324 NOTE F :

The debate that took place on Mr. Lindsay's resolution, is here sketched from the notes taken at the time. The Rev. Mr. Gallaher and Mr. Rob't Boal, opposed the Resolution at every stage. FIRST, they urged its postponement 'till October, arguing that the church of St. Charles ought in sound policy, to remain on neutral ground. THEN they endeavoured to "Emasculate" the resolution by depriving it of its distinctive character, and rendering it pointless and unmeaning. Both of those attempts failing, and the members being called upon to

to face and decide the PREVIOUS QUESTION. "Shall this Resolution pass?"

325 The Rev. Mr. Gallaher immediately took the floor in opposition: and with unusual zeal and eloquence addressed the meeting for nearly an hour. In the course of his remarks he indulged with great warmth and vehemence, in denouncing the "Old School General Assembly" as tyrannical and usurping in the highest degree. He characterised its acts in relation to the "excised Synod" as he called them, as worse, MUCH WORSE than inquisitorial; and declared his firm and unalterable determination, never to do any act, or sanction in any manner, any measure, that should countenance the Old School Assembly, until they shall repeal and repudiate their offensive acts.

MR. G. TOOK OCCASION TO DECLARE ALSO, THAT HE HAD NO INTENTION OR EXPECTATION OF CONNECTING HIMSELF WITH THE "NEW SCHOOL ASSEMBLY." altho' he did certainly approve, he said, of their views, doctrines and proceedings. At present however, he considered it the true policy of the church of St. Charles, in reference to the two Assemblies, not to commit herself to either at this time; but to suspend all action on the subject, for at least six months.; "especially ought we to refuse to continue in connection with the usurping, excising Assembly, so long as that abominable act remained unrepealed."--"For my part" said Mr. G. in his most emphatic manner, "I had rather submit to lose my right arm, than now to sanction any measure intended to approve, or to palliate, or submit to the excising and test actsm of the Old School Assembly."

326 Mr. Gallaher insisted, that a church may be essentially Presbyterian in character, AGREEABLY to THE FORM OF GOVERNMENT OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, WITHOUT HAVING ANY CONNECTION WHATSOEVER, WITH ANY GEN'L ASSEMBLY OR WITH ANY SYNOD; BUT ONLY WITH A PRESBYTERY. He dwelt much on this point; and very strenuously argued, that in the present PECULIAR circumstances and situation of the church of Saint Charles, we were called upon by sound policy and prudent foresight, to adopt and pursue that course for the present; and wait 'till the controversy that now so widely agitated the Presbyterian church at large, shall be satisfactorily decided and settled. Mr. Gallaher with great earnestness and, much FEELING, appealed to the meeting; entreating the members present; and very solemnly warning them, not to throw themselves into the power of the Old School division of the church, by adopting the Resolution before them; even tho' the convention of last October had recommended that course.

The whole address of the Rev'd gentleman was marked with a degree of animation, vehemence and feeling, very unusual even for him and evidently produced a deep sensation in the meeting.

327 Mr. Thomas Lindsay, Sen. and Mr. Watson then, in turn, offered remarks controverting some of the position taken by Mr. Gallaher in relation to the Acts of the General Assembly, so much complained of by him. Mr. Lindsay said, that he thought Mr. G. laboured under a strange delusion; and had indulged in unnecessary, and highly improper bitterness of remark. Mr. Lindsay and Mr. Watson both pronounced against the new theory of Presbyterianism proposed and advocated by Mr. Gallaher; and expressed their surprise and regret, that SUCH a scheme should ever have been recommended to a Presbyterian church by a Presbyterian minister.

328 Mr. Robt. Boal then addressed the meeting. He took substantially the same positions that Mr. Gallaher had assumed, and expressed himself with quite as much fervour and emphasis,-- adding his entire and settled conviction that the "Old School Assembly" is the true and only lawful "constitutional Assembly" and that this church could not consistently with duty and interest, remain under the care of the "Old School Assembly, tho' he did not propose any connection with ANY Assembly for the present; preferring to remain on Neutral

ground, as he argued we had a right to do, without compromising in the least, as he believed, our Presbyterian character or standing. And he feelingly called upon the meeting to wave the Resolution for some time at least, as the only course likely to conciliate the conflicting views then agitating the minds of the members. And he then solemnly announced, that if the friends of the Resolution persisted in pressing it to an affirmative decision ( which it was now evident that they might do if they chose ) and thus placed this church under the care and direction of "THE OLD SCHOOL" Judicatories; that then he and his friends would find themselves obliged by their own sense of their own duty, under such circumstances; to withdraw immediately from this church & communion.

329 And he very earnestly called upon those who were intending to vote for the Resolution, to pursue, and reflect upon the probable consequences that would result to the inquiry of this church, AND THE COMMUNITY; if by persisting in this measure, they should oblige him and his friends to separate themselves; and to form an organize another church! All which consequences, he declared he sincerely deprecated, and was most anxious to prevent. Mr. Boal presented this appeal ( which constituted his main and most reliable argument ) with all the pathos he was master of, and it was set forth in every aspect that was most likely to operate upon the sympathies and touch the feelings and passions of those he addressed; many of whom were young persons. And its effect was manifest, and most impressive on every person present.

330 Mr. Boal had been a Ruling Elder in the church since '38. He had long acted as Superintendent of the Sunday School--was uniformly active as an officer and member. And was very much respected and esteemed by the church and the community. The deliberate withdrawal of such a man from our church, at such a time, under such circumstances, to say nothing of the influence of his example upon many others who had long been accustomed to regard him as their guide, &c. could not but be deeply felt by all present.

And here, whilst under the influence of so much sympathy, Mr. Boal announced to the meeting ( he himself affected almost to tears, and several others QUITE so † that the adoption of the pending resolution by a majority of votes on the present occasion, would be assuredly, immediately followed by the withdrawal from the church of himself and friends, altogether about TWENTY in number. Having THUS produced such an excited state of feeling, Mr. Boal sat down--for some minutes a deep & solemn silence prevailed. The chairman, after waiting some time for any others to address the meeting; finding that no one seemed disposed to do so, and feeling desirous to avail himself of that privilege, before the final vote on the resolution was taken, called Mr. Jordan to take the chair; and then addressed the meeting, substantially and very nearly as follows.--

331 I feel it my duty ( said he ) which I do not like to forego; before the question is finally submitted for your decision of this Resolution, to address a few plain words to the meeting, principally in reply to what has been said by the Rev. Mr. Gallaher and Mr. Boal in opposition to its adoption and in commendation of their own project; which last I take for granted, they intend to carry into effect: PROVIDED the friends of the proposition now before us should prove to be in the minority.-- Those brethren have assumed positions, which however SINCERELY they may regard them as sound and expedient, and however fixed may be their purpose to adhere to and act upon them, and to influence

others by their advice to act upon them; and even to sever the ties of Christian brotherhood, rather than to forego their purpose; I must nevertheless endeavour in the discharge of MY duty as I apprehend it; to set this matter in its true light before the calm dispassionate judgment of the members here present; so that it may be seen where, and on whom, the blame and responsibility ought properly to rest, should those brethren withdraw from this church as they say they will, in the event of the adoption of the measure now under consideration.

I will premise, that it MY purpose, let what may ultimately betide this Resolution, to vote for its adoption; and I trust it will be found to be acceptable to a large majority of the members of this church. The peculiar condition of our church at this very time, instead of forbidding the adoption of this Resolution, does in my judgment, particularly call for and demand it.--

We have been too long; already resting under a doubtful character; and should long since have taken a decided stand. We ought to have planted ourselves, as a church, promptly on the platform recommended by the very able convention that set here in this house in October last. On the same principles embodied in the Resolution of our venerable friend Mr. Lindsay. We are called, upon, in my opinion, by the pressing and peculiar circumstances of our case, at this moment, not to omit, or postpone this matter a single day longer. As full and fair a representation of the church is now here present as we can reasonably expect to obtain at any future time, all the officers here, and we have also the benefit of the presence and assistance of the Rev. Mr. Gallaher, who has certainly manifested in his recent remarks, much interest in the affairs of the church; and altho' I for one, cannot at all agree with him in his views; yet it is satisfactory to know that those who DO agree with him, cannot have it to say that THEIR side of the question has lacked either zeal or ability, or opportunity in the discussion; whether this decision shall be in favour or not. NOW then is the fit time, to make our election between the proposition of Mr. Lindsay and that of Messrs. Gallaher and Boal.

I regret exceedingly that those brethren should have more thought it proper to recommend to us THEIR neutral plan at this time, as a counter project; and still more do I regret that Mr. Boal' should have deemed it fit to make his continuance with us, conditional upon the decision that we are now about to make. Doubtless it is the purpose of those brothers to force us into THEIR position, if they can--and if they fail, then they and their families and friends ( about twenty probably ) will immediately SECEDE from this church, and set up one more congenial with THEIR peculiar ideas of Presbyterianism. But let me ask them if they do not expect that the friends of this Resolution will peaceably submit, should they be voted down on this occasion? or do they imagine that we will secede if found to be the minority? I think I can very safely answer, that it is our honest purpose TO ABIDE THE DECISION, else we would not have met here.

We have, therefore, now before us, in effect, this plain issue-- Adhesion to the Old Government of the Presbyterian Church, as laid down in our Book of Discipline, irrespective of the Acts of the Gen'l Assembly of 1837 and 1838, so much complained of; or the Rev. Mr. Gallaher's and Mr. Boal's plan of NEUTRALITY; which being interpreted, means SECESSION from our old Government, and as I believe, from Presbyterianism, as we have, as a church, solemnly adopted it; and have for many years enjoyed it. One or the other of these position we must now take; for if we reject the first, which is the purport of the pending Resolution; we shall virtually adopt the other--for in the event of the negative decision on the question now before us, we have the gracious assurance, that Mr. Boal and his friends, with Mr. Gallaher ( who claims membership ) will NOT then withdraw from our fellowship, but will remain. For tho' those brethren are PRE DETERMINED as they avow, that they will not submit to be governed BY the church; yet they are perfectly willing to remain in connection therewith, provided THEY can govern it.



It is very unpleasant thus to be obliged in candid plainness, to comment even with this much severity, upon the course so explicitly indicated as about to be pursued by those brethren; but it seems to me that this is no time or occasion "TO MINCE MATTERS" and I shall therefore continue to speak very plainly tho' I trust in a spirit of allowable freedom and courtesy. From the votes already taken on  
 336 the post ponement and amendment of the Resolution, it is pretty evident I think, that a majority of the members present, are DISPOSED to adhere to the OLD Government of the church, upon the terms proposed by the Convention; tho' possibly THE THREATENED SECESSION THAT HAS BEEN SO ADROITLY SPRUNG UPON US, AS AN ADDITIONAL ISSUE, may produce a different result. I hope and trust not, however. For, however much we may lament the sudden withdrawal of some twenty members from our communion, with Messrs. Boal and Gallaher at their head; I do not perceive how the apprehension of such an event ought to prevent the rest of us from faithfully discharging OUR duty--how THEIR threatened secession ought in reason to influence US to hazard the sacrifice, of name, character, property and principles. I consider the expedient of holding this threat over us IN TERROR, as entirely uncalled for, unfair, ungenerous, out of place and out of character. And with difficulty can  
 337 believe the Brethren are serious in using it. And yet I am bound to understand them so; because they have so earnestly and so solemnly urged it upon us as an ARGUMENT to deter us from doing, what in the absence of that threat, it is manifestly our duty to do. In this manner they try to place themselves in the attitude of the prejudged victims of a heartless and cruel majority, forcing upon them a measure so obnoxious to their well known settled principles, as must of necessity compel them either to make a sacrifice of what they deem to be sacred principle, or else withdraw from the church. Thus by assuming a position that is so well calculated to enlist much sympathy in their behalf, and possibly defeat the resolution; these brothers doubtless expect to be able, should they leave us, to make US appear responsible for THEIR acts, as well as our own; on the pretence that we PURPOSELY adopted the Resolution to expel them from this church. ~~Thus by assuming a position~~ ~~that is so well calculated to~~ Now if those brethren have really adopted this, to my mind, very exceptionable course, from the motives, and with the expectations that  
 338 I have mentioned; I must tell them plainly, that they have entirely mistaken their way. Before they can make the friends of the Resolution in any sense or degree responsible for their acts; before they can say or INSINUATE with any propriety, that OUR adoption of this measure makes it THEIR duty as Presbyterian Christians to leave us, and justifies them AS SUCH in so doing; it is incumbent on them to show that there is something either in the letter or spirit of the Resolution that OUGHT in all reason and candour and Christian charity, to conflict with any one's opinions or even prejudices, so as to prevent Christians from worshipping together in harmony. And if they can show, that the obnoxious tendency of the proposed measure, was foreseen, and designed by its supporters to produce a secession. Neither of these has been yet shown, or attempted to be shown, and I am sure I hazard nothing when I say that no such attempt will ever be made further than by insinuation.

339 If I supposed, or even suspected any such latent quality in our good father Lindsay's proposition, or that he was capable of entertaining any such secret views; I would be the last to support or countenance either.

As I understand it, and as it has been fully explained by the mover, this Resolution is in exact accordance with the recommendation of the convention in October last; wisely devised for the purpose of quieting in Missouri Old School and New School disturbances, and for promoting peace and concord in the churches and which was concurred in by very nearly all the delegates present in the convention, ( and there were many present ) composed as it was of persons of every shade of Old and New School opinions. It cannot be deemed unreasonable for THIS church, circumstanced as we are, having witnessed the proceedings of that convention as they transpired on this floor, by our delegates participating largely in them; to accommodate ourselves, as a church, in good faith, to the excellent spirit of Christian compromise, that actuated the convention and so many of our churches in Missouri.

340

I regret very much that the acts of the General Assembly of 1837 and 1838, and the subsequent controversy; have been mentioned here on this occasion, and so much dilated on by Mr. Gallaher, or at all alluded to. The Resolution before us does not call for, or of necessity involve any discussion of any act or acts of any General Assembly ( on the contrary, part of its design is to suppress all such useless bickerings. ) not are we now invited, or in any manner called upon or even allowed ( in order ) to take sides either for or against the Acts so bitterly denounced by the Rev. Brother. Those who approve of it, UNDERSTANDINGLY are denied by the resolution to subscribe their names to it; signifying thereby their intention to adhere to the established forms of Government of the Presbyterian church in the United States of America; without approving or condemning any of the Acts of our supreme Judicatory, in this OUR public act, or at all interfering with the individual right of opinion touching the TWO acts of Assembly that have produced such unhappy commotion in the churches. So I understand this proposition, and am prepared to act upon this understanding of it. And altho' I do, and always have, most heartily approved of the Act commonly designates ( very improperly, I believe ) the "excising Act" of 1837, and as heartily disapprove of the "Test Act" so called of 1838, I shall not allow my opinions in relation to either of those acts to influence me in the discharge of my duty now before me. I believe the Assembly so long established and known, with all its appendages of clerks, records, archives and SUCCESSION, is THE General Assembly; as it has been DEFINITELY decided to be, by the Judgment of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania.

341

342

That Assembly may pass acts highly injurious to the interests of the Church ( in the opinion of the MINORITIES that oppose their passage ) just as the Congress may pass acts highly detrimental to our national interests. And a majority of the members of this church may think fit in the discharge of their duty as THEY believe, to adopt a Resolution now under discussion; the opposition of our brothers Gallaher & Boal and others, notwithstanding. Yet, I do not believe that the MINORITY in either case, can consistently with reason and common propriety, set up any claim, to be the true assembly, or the true Congress or the true church of St. Charles.-- All such pretensions would be at war with the spirit and vitality of free institutions. Minorities certainly have their rights; but AUTHORITY can only rightfully rest with the majority-- And tho' majorities may, and often do, err, it is a happy TRUTH that "ERROUR OF OPINION MAY BE SAFELY TOLERATED, WHERE REASON IS LEFT FREE TO COMBAT IT." In this way, and ONLY in this way, can wrong decision of any of our representative Assemblies, civil or ecclesiastical, be corrected. Any attempt to do it otherwise is REVOLUTIONARY, and utterly inconsistent with the vital principles upon which all our free institutions are based. And I am sure that this truth applies to our ecclesiastical ( Religious ) interests and safety, with at least as much force as it does to those of a CIVIL nature. I trust, therefore, that the Rev. Mr. Gallaher and Mr. Boal, do not propose, after the example of the New School minority in the Assembly of 1837; to set themselves and their friends up as the First Presbyterian Church of Saint Charles in the event of their being found in the minority upon the present pending question.

343

I have been reluctantly drawn into this digression by the remarks of Mr. Gallaher and Mr. Boal, but for those uncalled for remarks; I should not have uttered one word here, about Old School-ism, or New School-ism. But the friends of the measure now under consideration, are bound, I think to place themselves, as well as the subject, in their proper attitude; so that their real views and intentions may not be misunderstood here, or hereafter misrepresented. AND I AM DETERMINED THAT WHATEVER MAY BE THE RESULTS OF THIS MEETING; THE FACTS, SAYINGS, AND DOINGS, AS THEY ACTUALLY TRANSPIRE, SHALL NOT ONLY BE UNDERSTOOD NOW, BUT PRESERVED FOR FUTURE REFERENCE, SUBSTANTIALLY AND CORRECTLY.

I am not only much surprised, but grieved to hear Mr. Boal announce his intention of leaving our church, if a majority shall think it proper to decide against his views and advice. There does not appear to my mind, any sufficient cause for such separation. Unless he and his friends differ from us in essential doctrinal views, ( which has never been suggested by them ) a difference of opinion about a mere secular act that has long since been laid asleep; ought not to be allowed at this time to trouble us: for in reality, it does not concern us as a Christian church, and is in my opinion entirely too small and remote a matter, candidly considered, to be allowed as a just cause for so important and consequential a movement.

The measure now proposed in this Resolution, demands from none of us any sacrifice of any principles or opinion--it requires no sacrifice of any kind, further than is consistent with the duty and obligations of professing Christians. This I deliberately assert, after a careful examination of the whole ground, and feel that I may safely challenge, and DO challenge any one to assert any show the contrary. But on the other hand, if we acced to the counter project of Messrs. Boal and Gallaher; that is, abandon the plan of the convention, as provided in this Resolution, and dissolve our connection with Synod and Gen'l Assembly, AND CONSEQUENTLY WITH ANY PRESBYTERY SO CONNECTED (I beg you to consider well this last unavoidable consequence ) We should most assuredly enganger, nay certainly sacrifice our very existence as a Presbyterian church; for without stopping to discuss the idle abstraction that we may claim that distinctive name and character, and enjoy all its benefits; and yet secede from the established Constitution and Government; I am sure I hazard nothing when I say, that if thus disjoined, we can have no just right either to the character or privileges of a Presbyterian church; and if we sacrifice and forfeit those; we MUST also with them forfeit also, and lose inevitably, the property we hold in this Building and the Lot of ground on which it stands, conformable with the express terms of the title deed to the lot. Of this I entertain no doubt.

If I have made myself understood; and am correct in the views I have expressed ( and I sincerely believe I am ) is it not perfectly plain that the sacrifices consequent upon the project of Mr. Gallaher, as endorsed by brother Boal, are immeasurably greater than any that can by any possibility, ever result from our adoption of the convention's recommendation, as provided in this Resolution?

Now if we accept and pursue the advice of the convention, some few of us, probably not more than five or six individuals, may have to give up a little PRIDE OF OPINION, upon an almost obsolete question; upon a matter of no substance, or real importance to ANY of US; and this I venture to say will be the utmost extent of our SACRIFICE, if sacrifice it can be called.

But if we REJECT that advice, as our two brothers would fain persuade us to do; our VERYNLEAST sacrifice must be these solid walls; our House of worship. Such a decision would be equivalent to a Declaration of Independence, and consequently a renunciation of our good old constitution, and excellent SCRIPTURAL form of church Government; the best model of Government Ecclesiastical or civil, in my humble opinion, that the world has ever yet seen.

If the Reb. Mr. Gallaher and Brother Boal, or any other members of this church, are willing to make all these sacrifices, rather than yield a little pride of opinion; it is far more than I can do. And if they are so bent on that course as to be willing even to dissever, by their own act, those ties of Christian fraternity that have so long connected us, rather than forego their purpose, I shall regret exceedingly the resolution they have taken, and would fain persuade them if I were able, to give it up. But believing firmly that the Convention is right, and that Mr. Gallaher is entirely wrong, in the premises; which I believe has been clearly shown; and that NOW is the time to act decisively; MY duty is plainly set before me; and I have no choice but to perform it faithfully without flinching.

The sudden secession of so large a portion of our church, cannot be contemplated with indifference, or without much pain, by any of us, I presume, the less so because no sufficient or even plausible reason has yet been assigned.

We are therefore forced to the conclusion, that these brethren must be acting under some strange delusion, which has PRE DETERMINED them before they came to this meeting, to pursue the course they have just announced; in the event of their finding  
 348 the church decidedly adverse to THEIR FAVORITE project of neutrality. If they do go off on this wild theory, they will doubtless persuade as many of our small number as they can, to accompany them. If they fail to convert THIS Church to their views, they are prepared ( so they have announced ) to organize ANOTHER church here, in accordance with those views. But I have greatly mistaken the MEANING of certain hints that have been dropped by them ( inadvertently no doubt ) if the proposed new organization, will not eventually, if not immediately become connected with the SECEDING General Assembly, and that too under the auspices of the Rev. Mr. Gallaher, This is only a conjecture of my own however; time will disclose whether or not I am correct therein.

Now if our brothers do really prefer the NEUTRAL course they have indicated; or secretly intend to place themselves under the care of the NEW SCHOOL ASSEMBLY; who can hinder them? I believe they are fully bent on one or the other of those two courses, whether the old members of this church will consent to accompany them or not; and that nothing short of OUR ACCEDING to THEIR plan can prevent their  
 349 secession from this church. Upon those points my mind is perfectly well settled. I have never felt the least repugnance towards any of the brethren however, on account of our difference of opinion touching any acts of our church judicatories; any more than I have because of a difference of opinion in reference to any of the acts of the national or state legislatures. A perfect concurrence of opinion upon ANY MERE SECULAR MATTER, is not to be expected in any community or church. As professing Christians of the Presbyterian "CONFESSION OF FAITH"; are we not all agreed? I put the question: Do we not all profess to be agreed upon the settled doctrines of our church? Are we, or are we not Christians in reality? If we are, this threat of separation MERELY ON ACCOUNT OF A LITTLE PRIDE OF opinion about a mere secular transaction of not the smallest consequence to us, sounds extremely harsh and unpleasant in my ears; and much more so as it comes from a Presbyterian minister, and a Presbyterian Elder; both of long and mature experience, and of  
 350 much personal and official influence in the community as well as in the church. I desire to touch this point as lightly as possible, consistently with what I feel to be my duty on this occasion. The question now before the church, I am happy to know, MUST be forthwith definitely settled; so that every doubt as to our actual position in the Presbyterian church at large will be removed. Or in other words, we must now decide whether or not this is to continue a branch of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America. Whether we shall pursue the course recommended by the convention; or that proposed by Mr. Gallaher. Whether we shall secede or not. The question is of vital importance to us, and we should face it with a solemn sense of our duty and responsibility. And I trust it will be well and distinctly understood now, and hereafter borne in mind; that if any SECESSION shall unhappily follow our decision of this present question, those who may act therein shall be considered as FREE AGENTS, and therefore entirely responsible for their own acts.

Here the debate ended. The main question was immediately put, and resulted as before stated page 301. Ayes 24 Noes 17.

351 See pages 302-303. It is worthy of notice here, that these three resolutions offered by Mr. Boal in quick succession ( as fast as acted on ) bore indisputable evidence of their having been drawn up and prepared, PREVIOUSLY to the meeting.. they were all handed to the chair, WRITTEN IN INK, IN MR. BOAL'S HAND WRITING; ON SEPARATE SLIPS OF PAPER. ( This was noted at the time by the chairman and Secretary. ) Now as there was neither ink or pen in the church, a fact evidently known to the chair, as well as to the Secretary and others, and as Mr. Boal never once left the church 'till the meeting closed; it is certain that the writing must have been done elsewhere, and before the meeting took place.

This circumstance is not mentioned here, as matter very censurable at all, or onr that Mr. Boal could be suppose desirous of concealing; but merely to prove that SECESSION HAD BEEN DELIBERATELY DETERMINED ON PREVIOUSLY TO THE MEETING; in the even of the rejection of Mr. Gallaher's neutral project, or the refusal to post-pon~~e~~, &c.

352 The first of these resolutions is manifestly unnecessary, because the Session already possessed as much authority on the subject as the church; and needed no such extra-official instruction.

The SECOND in order, providing for the raising of TWO HUNDRED DOLLARS for Mr. Gallaher, by VOLUNTARY SUBSCRIPTIONS, &c., was not considered at the time by ANY one, it is believe, as BINDING the church, or any others, to pay Mr. G. that sum of money, or any part of it, --it bears no such construction on its face: if it does, it binds the church as it was THEN on its passage, and not the church as it might be, after the contemplated secession, thus exempting the SECEDERS from any part of the expense.

353 But in fact it binds NO ONE; unless it be the Deacons, who are REQUESTED to circulate a subscription; and such individuals as might choose to subscribe any portion of the sum demanded. And if it could be considered obligatory on the members of the church to SUBSCRIBE, it was equally so on Mr. Boal and the other seceders, as it was on any others. The reasons assigned by Messrs Lindsay, Reid and Sibley, for opposing this resolution, was; that Mr. Gallaher had already collected by dint of much importunity ON THE PLEA OF POVERTY, AND THE ACTUAL WANTS OF HIS FAMILY; much more money from the church, than he ever was entitled to ask or receive, upon any promise, or obligation whatever, for SERVICES. If ever there was any subscription circulated for this purpose, the writer never saw or heard of it; and believes there never WAS any ( he himself paid Mr. Gallaher Fifty dollars in mistaken charity sometime before the meeting )

This \$200 demand of Mr. Boal, like that contained in his third resolution, was considered very extraordinary at the time--his seceding friends, every one of them, it is believed, voted for it; and perhaps one or two others. The greater number of the members refused to vote for or against it. Not more than five or six negative voices were heard by the chairman. This note of explanation is inserted here, because Mr. Gallaher has complained openly, that the "Hill Church" has wronged him out of TWO HUNDRED DOLLARS, that they had solemnly assumed to raise for him upon Mr. Boal's resolution passed as above, &c.

354 Mr. Boal's THIRD Resolution excited so much surprise, not to say indignation, that he thought fit to withdraw it before there was any vote taken. It was utterly impracticable, and indefensible. SUCH a demand could only be excusable, if at all, on the ground that those brethern were FORCED wrongfully out of the church. And indeed it does appear quite probable that it was thus made, in order to put that face on their PRE-DETERMINED secession; but as they failed entirely in all their efforts fo show any wish or intention on the part of the supporters of the resolution, of Mr. Lindsay ( or that the Resolution itself had any such bearing ) to force them out; which the sketch of the debate most clearly proves; the introduction of that resolution ( the third ) was evidently out of place, having been drawn up, with the others, most probably with the view of "CAPPING A CLIMAX", but as the CLIMAX could not be made out or produced upon the occasion, the ready made cap ~~appeared~~ proved altogether superflous. These three resolutions, having been all prepared before the meeting took place- seem to speak thus: WE FULLY EXPECT TO QUIT YOUR COMMUNION, AND MEAN TO GET ALL WE CAN OUT OF YOU BEFORE WE SEPARATE FROM YOU.

355 NOTE: Immediately after the adjournment of the meeting, when nearly all the members were yet in the house; Mr. Gallaher and Mr. Boal collected their families and friends and followers together in the south west corner of the church, and proceeded at once to organize ANOTHER church: and it was, all intents and purposes, a "New School" church in embryo. So distinctly avowed, in hearing of the writer and others, by the greater portion of those forming the New Association-- A strange occurrence, truly.

Another fact connected with the history of these proceedings, must be mentioned here.

356 From the moment the church meeting was decided on and regularly appointed, till its termination, and for some time after, the Rev. Mr. Gallaher manifested a degree of hostility amounting to vindictiveness, against many individual members of this church, who had dissented from HIS views; several of whom had most liberally contributed to provide for his family in the belief founded on his own repeated declarations, that he was too poor to support them himself. The Rev. Gentleman is known also to have indulged himself on many occasions, in St. Charles and elsewhere, in very severe censorious remarks, about the "Church on the Hill", as he denominates the 1st. Church.

Mr. G. tries to injure the character and influence of this church by the use of slurs, nicknames, and contemptuous expressions--calling us "A QUARRLSOME SET"; insinuating, if not directly charging, that HE has been more shamefully treated by us. Money due him for services withheld--his friends driven out, and forced to organize a new church; and many other sayings neither consistent with his office and profession, OR WITH THE TRUTH. Wherefore, the foregoing narrative has been set in order, the writer deeming it NECESSARY, for the purpose of preventing unfair and injurious prejudices from warping the minds of strangers; especially of professing Christians who come to live in and near Saint Charles, such more especially as may belong to the Presbyterian Communion.

357 It is believed that those who feel interested enough to give the foregoing pages a careful and candid perusal ( so far as relates to Mr. Gallaher's connection with this church ) together with the following APPENDIX, will be able to determine correctly, where the truth may be found as touching the transaction and occurrences therein related.

The narrator expressly disclaims any feeling of personal resentment towards the Rev. Mr. Gallaher or Mr. Boal, or any others of the SECESSIONS; certainly he has never had any cause for such feeling. But he cannot BUT lament any condemn their course as Presbyterians; not withhold his undisguised censure and SOME of Mr. Gallaher's sayings and doings in relation to the 1st. Presbyterian Church of St. Charles, Let the impartial reader judge.

SAINT CHARLES-- October 1840.

A P P E N D I X

358

"THE CHARACTER OF THIS CHURCH AND CONGREGATION FOR PEACE AND CONCORD, HAVING BEEN CALLED IN QUESTION"\* and the direct charge having been made against us and reiterated again and again by the Rev. James Gallaher, that we are a "QUARRLSOME SET", and the same "rung upon all changes" not a little to our injury, and to the deception of others; a plain statement of facts in connection with the History of this church, and touching the accusation circulated by Mr. Gallaher, appears to be demanded at this time ( and to be preserved as of Record) in order that those interested may the better understand, and appreciate our REAL character as a Christian community- - - For a minister of the Gospel, of the Age, experience and influence of the Rev. James Gallaher, to say, and often repeat, of US, to christian brethern, who may perchance be strangers come to reside within our bounds, "THAT WE ARE A QUARRLSOME SET" is surely well calculated

\* See the printed pamphlet, with which this volume commences, Chap. I, for more ample details.

359

to render us, as a church, more or less odious, in the estimation of strangers, at least. If this odious character with which Mr. Gallaher has so freely branded us, does indeed belong to us, in whole or in part; if this church is in truth "A QUARRLSOME SET" to a degree so very unusual and vile, as to deserve the public rebuke of the Gospel Ministry; and the especial denunciation of the Rev. Mr. Gallaher, who resides among us, and for more than a year was associated with us as an enrolled member ( tho' but little WITH us in point of fact ); it is high time that we were awakened to a proper conception of our sad defect, in order that a reformation may be speedily brought about; FOR A QUARRLSOME CHURCH is not only JUSTLY odious in the Rev. Mr. Gallaher's sight, and in the sight of all good people; but is far more so in the sight of our Lord and Master.

Let us then candidly and faithfully investigate this matter--and with all consistent brevity.

360

"THE FIRST PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH OF ST. CHARLES. " was organized ( and so called ) on the 30th day of August 1818, by the Rev. Salmon Giddings, Pastor at St. Louis, assisted by the Rev. Mr. Matthews; and was composed of the "following nine persons-- John Bracken, Theophilus Mc Pheters, Thomas Lindsay, Margaret, his wife-Ebenezer Ayres, Deborah, his wife- and Elizabeth Hamons--Members of the "Presbyterian Churches in different parts"--under the following Covenant.

361

"Desirous of enjoying the benefit of the means of grace which God hath appointed for the benefit of men, We the subscribers, in order to obtain and maintain the public worship of God; that we may live more to His glory, promote each others growth in grace, and spiritual edification, by living conformably to rules which the Lord Jesus hath appointed for the perfecting of His Saints; Do hereby unite as a church, to be known as THE FIRST PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH OF SAINT CHARLES.. And we solemnly covenant to watch over each other, in the Lord, and in the spirit of Christian love, meekness and forbearance; to admonish and receive admonition, as the Lord shall give us grace and strength: to walk as becometh saints before the world: to maintain the worship of God in our families: to attend to all the means of grace, and the ordinances which God our Saviour hath appointed to be observed in His church. We take the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, for the rule of our faith and practice; and the Westminister Confession of Faith and Directory, as the best summary and explanation thereof."--(Signed)-----  
At the same time Mr. Thomas Lindsay, Sen. ( an Elder from South Carolina )

was elected Ruling Elder (Sometime in the next year, 1819, Mr. A. Watson an Elder from Waterford, New York, was elected an Elder in this church.)

The Rev. Timothy Flint supplied the pulpit of the little church, till the 26th March 1819, when he removed to Arkansaw. At that time there were TWENTY-FIVE members. Not long after the departure of Mr. Flint, the Rev. Charles S. Robinson took charge of the church and officiated as its pastor till his death; which took place in September 1828. At THIS time ( Mr. R.'S decease ) FORTY-FIVE members had been enrolled.

There is abundant evidence, that from the organization of the church to Mr. Robinson's departure, as much harmony, to say the least, prevailed therein, as it is usual to find in any OTHER CHURCH. Some few cases of discipline, for which "THE WORLD" censured the Session--but there was no QUARREL in the church.

Not long after the death of Mr. Robinson, 24 individuals ( 14 of whom were not members ) invited the Rev. Hiram Chamberlain to St. Charles as in the place of Mr. Robinson; but Mr. C. declined, for the reason, as he stated "that Mr. Lindsay the Elder, and the late Pastor's family, had refused to join the invitation"--Some excitement was produced about this affair, but it was in "THE WORLD" not in the church. In 1830, the Rev. Geo. C. Wood came to St. Charles, and was employed as STATED SUPPLY, for a year, at the expiration of which, the Rev. Mr. Hale officiated for a year; who was succeeded, also for a year, by the Rev. Warren Nichols, who left in Sept. 1834. Up to this period 168 members had been received into the church in all. In the case of the Rev. Mr. Wood, as to his further employment, there was a division of the Session, and of the church also. Mr. Lindsay, the Sen. Elder, objected; considering Mr. W. too young and inexperienced. ( he had but very seldom preacher before he came to St. Charles ) and tho' he esteemed him ( as we all did ) very highly, yet Mr. L. did not believe him qualified for the charge, and would not consent to retain him--in this Mr. L. was firmly sustained by about 20 of the Senior members of the church.

Mr. Milton P. Cayce, the other Elder ( there were only those two in the church then ) a young man who was ordained under Mr. Wood in 1831; was of a different opinion, and was solicitous to keep Mr. W. another year, and was warmly supported by a majority of the members, who like Mr. W. and Mr. C. were young persons for the most part. As was usual "THE WORLD" took part in the affair, and of course some degree of excitement ensued. But this was all quickly allayed by the prudent and proper course of Mr. Wood; who retired from the field and left St. Charles, leaving the church in harmony, and carrying with him the good will and affection of every member.

Here again, tho' there was undoubtedly some improper warmth of feeling wilst the excitement lasted, yet there was no "QUARREL" in the church, from first to last A difference of opinion supported on both sides, with equal tenacity, no doubt existed, even for some time after the cause had been removed. But if there was any QUARREL, it was "The World" that QUARRELED; not the church. In the whole course of the "affair about Mr. Wood", there was no feeling or language indulged in by any member of the church; held so angry, vutuperative and QUARRELSOME, as that used by the Rev. Mr. Gallaher at the meeting of the church in April, 1840--and subsequently on some other occasions.

Thus we have traced our history, step by step, omitting nothing material to the point, from Sept. 1818 to Sept. 1834, when Mr. Nichols left us. During those 16 years, we can find no evidence whatever, to justify the allegation put forth by Mr. Gallaher.

If the appellative "QUARRELSOME SET" attaches to the church of St. Charles. at this present time ( the 28th October 1840 ) it must have been obtained that



odious character within the last FIVE or SIX years. Let us pursue the enquiry further.

365 In November 1834, the church UNANIMOUSLY invited the Rev. F. R. Gray to be their pastor--it then consisted of about SEVENTY members. The nomination of Mr. Gray was made at a large public meeting, held at the court house after due notice had been given out. Several persons took part in the proceedings, who did not claim to be members of any church; and from THAT quarter there was some little opposition to Mr. Gray, with the sole view however, of substituting the Rev. Hiram Chamberlain. The resolution or motion to invite Mr. Gray was passed however, when the question was put from the chair, WITH ENTIRE UNANIMITY. And excellent feeling prevailed in the church AND CONGREGATION, AT THAT TIME, as it had some time previously.

It was understood at the time of inviting Mr. Gray, that his engagement at Columbia would not admit of his coming to St. Charles sooner than in May '35, if he accepted our call., ~~the Session could provide a temporary supply~~, the meeting was a resolution desiring the Session to provide a temporary supply in the meantime, designating two minister ( Mr. Brown and Mr. Lovejoy) to be employed, if either  
366 of them could be obtained. This arrangement was also made with perfect unanimity. But neither of those ministers could come to St. Charles, both having other engagements.

Mr. Chamberlain came here early in January 1835. Some of his particular friends, in and out of the church, wished the Session to employ HIM as the temporary supply; but they declined to do so. ONE of the Elders, and a few of the more recent members, together with a number of others, NOT members, determined to retain Mr. Chamberlain, not only as a temporary supply, but with the view of placing him over the church as settled Pastor. Unfortunately Mr. Chamberlain, too readily concurred and co-operated in this movement. All the officers of the church, ( there were then 7 Elders and 2 Deacons ) except one Elder, opposed and protested against these proceedings, and were supported by a majority of the church, including nearly all the members of long standing. When these events were transpiring, the Session were in negotiation with Mr. Gray agreeably to the request of the November meeting; and not having yet received any decisive answer from  
367 him they were of course constrained by a sense of common propriety, if not official duty, to dissent from, and object to, the Chamberlain invitation, ( or an invitation to ANY other than Mr. Gray ) whatever may have been their personal feelings towards Mr. Chamberlain.

The unhappy and protracted controversy that was thus commenced, in which "THE WORLD" as usual again, took AN ACTIVE part, and as usual against the church; has already been fully narrated in this volume; and is is confidentially submitted to the candid reader whether or not the church of St. Charles, as such, was drawn in this QUARREL, from any innate disposition "TO QUARREL", peculiar to herself-- Or whether ANY OTHER church might not have been thus unhappily embroiled by the operation of the same external influences. That THE CHURCH had JUSTICE on her side may be very fairly inferred from the decisions of ALL the Judicatories before which it was successively carried, including the final judgment and order of the General Assembly on the 1st June last; which will be found in this Volume.

368 PENDING the unfortunate difficulty with Mr. Chamberlain, and nearly two years before the definitive action of the General Assembly in that case the Church of St. Charles invited Mr. Gallaher to the pastoral charge; which he did not DECLINE certainly. And Mr. G. connected himself and family, as members, with this church, a year, lacking a few days, before the final decision of the "Chamberlain affair."

From these facts, it may be very reasonably concluded, that to the 28th of April, 1840, or perhaps it might be more correct to say, about the 1st of January last: Mr. Gallaher did not consider this church as a "QUARRELSOME SET", either in

reference to our difficulties with Mr. Chamberlain, or our possible course in relation to himself, and the measure recommended by the October Convention. And may we not also infer that the Rev. Gentleman entertained no such unfavourable opinion of us at the opening of the meeting of April last? Until near the close of that meeting, Mr. Gallaher certainly manifested no unwillingness to continue in our connection in character of "Stated Supply", when the reconsideration of Mr. Jordan's resolution, which certainly threatened the rejection of Mr. G's services; induced him to request the withdrawal of the Resolution which being done, at once dissolved all connection on his part, with this church.

369

And when at the April meeting a decided majority of the church, thought proper to adopt the CONCILIATORY plan of the convention, a plan eminently adapted to its object "to prevent divisions and QUARRELS in the churches," who opposed it? who by the use of intemperate language, threats of secession, unauthorised and groundless insinuations, SEEMED at least, to be courting a quarrel with the church? And who finally, in hot haste, and in wrath, actually went off with his family and followers and organised a new church antagonistic to the church they thus suddenly left? Let the Rev. Gallaher answer these questions; and point out to whom most justly and appropriately may be applied the epithet he is so fond of bandaging.

370

How far this church is obnoxious to the charge of being QUARRELSOME, during the time they were so patiently waiting for Mr. Gallaher's protracted silence ( and absence ) touching their call; the reader may judge from the preceding narrative of facts; and from the same source, may, without any difficulty, doubt or delay, decide at once, as to the character, temper and propriety of the proceedings of the meeting on the 28th April last, whether or not there was manifested on that occasion a quarrelsome disposition on the part of the majority, ( now constituting the church ) exciting as the occasion undoubtedly was.

It should have been noted before, that previously to the call of Mr. Gallaher, the church of St. Charles had been visited by several ministers. Some of them by invitation.

Among the latter, was the Rev. Alexander Campbell, now of Mississippi, who remained several months in St. Charles with his family; and often officiated in our church as Stated supply; but without any expectation of remaining with us, as he was intending to settle in Mississippi.

371

Mr. Campbell openly and zealously expounded the "New School" side of the Presbyterian controversy, AND FOR THAT REASON WAS NOT INVITED TO REMAIN WITH THIS CHURCH, WHICH AT THAT TIME (1837) WAS NEARLY IF NOT ENTIRELY, unanimous in adherence to the "Old School" Assembly. But there was never any QUARREL with Mr. Campbell, or anything like a quarrel. On the contrary, the many amiable and excellent qualities and Christian virtues possessed and manifested by him; endeared him very much not only to the community at large, but to all the members of this church. His preaching during his stay, was always well attended by the church and was always acceptable and profitable.

372

During the TWENTY TWO years of its existence as a regularly constituted Body, THE FIRST PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH OF SAINT CHARLES has certainly had to encounter and endure and overcome, her full measure of trials, afflictions and persecutions. In carefully and candidly tracing her part history to the present time; whilst it is not pretended that she has not erred, and swerved from duty in many instances, or that she has never been troubled with dissensions to some extent, (Where is there a church or community that has not?) Yet it may with truth be said of her, that whatever OTHER sins may be justly charged against her ( as a church ), that of being a "QUARRELSOME SET", in the sense obviously intended by the Rev. James Gallaher, in HIS use of the epithet; namely, a characteristic vice; is unfounded in fact, and entirely gratuitous.

373

The unfavourable impression that such a charge, emanating from such a source, is so likely to produce, especially on the minds of strangers (however destitute of truth it may be) DEMANDS this special notice in this place; and calls for such correction, in the premises, as is warranted by undeniable facts, fairly deducible from the History of this church from its organization to the present time. And this I have endeavoured faithfully to do. I do conscientiously believe, that what is set forth in this APPENDIX, touching this subjectm is all substantially correct and true.

And with a due sense of my responsibility I freely and fearlessly commend the whole narrative from page 289 to this, inclusive, to the candid consideration of any inbiassed reader, who may feel interest enough in it, as connected with the history and character of this church; to give it a perusal.

In all the labour that I have taken up myself, in searching out, collating and writing out AUTHENTIC AND RELIABLE FACTS, and incidents connected with our History; my sole purpose has been, truthfully and faithfully, to do justice to, and to vindicate so far as is consistent with the truth, the character and names, of a much wronged, maligned and persecuted Church of Jesus Christ.

GEO. C. SIBLEY.

Lindenwood, 28th October, 1840

THE HISTORY OF THE  
FIRST PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH  
OF SAINT CHARLES, MISSOURI.

-----

Continued from pages 188 and 357.

---

The "Chamberlain Disturbance", as it is called, received its FINAL QUIETUS in October 1841, when the effort was made by Mr. Chamberlain himself in the Synod to filch from the church her NAME, and appropriate it to the new organization over which he had just been placed.

375 See pages 186-187 and 188.-- In point of fact Mr. C's proceedings had almost entirely ceased to be felt annoying to the first church since about the time of Mr. Gallaher's election in June 1838. It is true, that Mr. C. did not abandon his designs, or repress his efforts to effect them; and had on one occasion well nigh carried his point; but an immediate application to the proper authority disarmed him, and rendered all his subsequent efforts negatory and abortive, and he ceased from troubling from and after the 16th October 1841.

The election of the Rev. James Gallaher took place 13th June 1838, See pages 289-90, and all HIS connection with this church, whatever that connection may have been, ceased and determined from and after the 28th April, 1840. See page 355.

## HISTORY, &amp;c., continued.

Soon after the church meeting of 28th April, 1840, (Some time in June) a certain personage calling himself "THE REV. CHARLES NICOLL D. D. OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH OF CANADA, came to St. Charles, and made himself known to Mr. Thos. Lindsay the Sen. Elder, to whom he exhibited testimonials of his rank and standing, &c., all of which ~~APPEARED~~ correct, and in due form; and were deemed satisfactory--"DOCTOR NICOLL" claimed FRATERNITY with Mr. Lindsay not only as a Christian, but as a Scotchman also. The story ran thro' our church and community; that the "DOCTOR" was an OPULENT and highly distinguished clergyman, and not less eminent for literary attainments, and intimacy with the great and eminent men of the day, particularly in England and Scotland: that he was absent from his charge in Canada, on leave, was travelling at his leisure, for recreation and information, &c, preaching the gospel as opportunity served; and had come to St. Charles to offer his occasional services in our church, having heard that we were then without a minister.

377 "DR. NICOLL" was in person, a short thickset man, somewhere about fifty years of age; very awkward in his gait and manner; complexion ruddy; and of PLUMP full habit.--- he SPOKE the English language correctly, but with a strong Scottish brogue--possessed of an almost inexhaustible fund of anecdote, chiefly in relation to men and incidents in "HIGH LIFE" in Scotland and England; which he seemed ever ready and willing to introduce into his familiar conversations; and which he had the tact and talent to TELL in the most appropriate and best manner: The "DOCTOR notwithstanding some obstinate anti-republican notions that he held, soon obtained a hospitable reception not only in the family of Mr. Lindsay ( where he made his home) but pretty generally in our church and community.

378 He was, of course, invited by the Session to occupy our pulpit during his sojourn here; and did in fact enter into a kind of informal agreement to preach for us for two or three months or more, as might be mutually convenient and agreeable. The impression generally was, that "DR. NICOLL" being very wealthy, and actuated by Christian liberality, would rather spurn, than stipulate for, any pecuniary compensation for ministerial services for the time he might stay in St. Charles. This impression got abroad, no doubt, from what he himself had said to Mr. Lindsay and others.

379 "DR. NICOLL" prolonged his stay here 'till late in November or early in December 1840. He preached regularly in our church, 'till about the middle of October ( when Rev. Mr. Muson arrived at St. Charles, and was engaged for six months on trial. Mr. M. was a licentiate just from Indiana) and occasionally afterwards, 'till he went away. His preaching was at first, most acceptable; indeed, it is believed that ALL the sermons he delivered were excellent, unexceptionable ( at least to Presbyterians ) and of a high order of composition and delivery.---But this man had not been here two months, when doubts arose in the minds of many ( Mr. Lindsay among them) that all was not right with him: that is to say, it began to be suspected that he had practiced a deception on us in relation to his personal character and standing, as well as to his official and literary pretensions. He was most evidently intemperate in his habits--IN FACT A DRUNKARD. His own WRITTEN compositions, proved him to be illiterate--his testimonials upon closer scrutiny, bore marks of fraud--his claims to a large estate--wealth--rich Library, etc.--were unfounded. In fact, "DR. NICOLL" proved to be an imposter, and was subsequently advertised as such, somewhere eastward, and the church warned against him. Still more recently he was detected and publicly exposed in Michigan.

On leaving Mr. Lindsay's, where he had been most kindly treated, and nursed for several weeks in a severe illness, in the most tender manner; he manifested a spirit of deepest ingratitude--actually cursing, instead of thanking his hospitable benefactor.

380

It is strange how this man was able to acquit himself so unexceptionably in the pulpit, ( when duly sober, which was not always the case ) his sermons were able composed, the language chaste, classical and forcible, rich in Scriptural illustrations: and delivered with great earnestness, and apparent zeal for the cause of Gospel truth. He possessed certainly a wonderful tenacious and capacious memory, and it seems probable that he had obtained and committed a great number of sermons, not his own, together with some forms of prayers, &c And that his pretended personal familiarity with such men as Hill, Chalmers, James, Wellington, Peale and others, had no other foundation, than a fund of anecdote that he had gathered and stored in his memory.

So much for "DR. NICOLL"-- But remember this, good reader,, OUR CHURCH HAD <sup>no</sup> QUARREL WITH THIS MAN, nor any individual in it.

As has been already noted, the Rev. Asahel Munson, a licenciate from Hanover, Indiana, came to St. Charles in October 1840, highly recommended to this church by Rev. Mr. Scovell. He had but been recently license~~d~~ to preach, and was seeking a location. The Session immediately engaged him for six months, as on trial, with an understanding that at the expiration of that time, the Church would be called upon to decide as to any future engagement of his services.

Sunday, 14th March 1841--agreeably to notices duly given out from the pulpit, and by the Session, tje church was this day, immediately after the morning service called together, and organized in the usual manner ( G. C. Sibley, appointed chairman, & N. B. Barron clerk. ) for the purpose of considering and determining, whether this church will call the Rev. Asahel Munson ( who had been her on trial for six months past ) to be the settled pastor thereof. The following members composed the meeting, VIZ:

- |                              |                           |
|------------------------------|---------------------------|
| 1. Thos. Lindsay, Sen. Elder | 1.3. Thomas Lindsay, Jun. |
| 2. Sam'l Watson, Elder       | 14. Ann G. Durfee         |
| 3. Niriam B. Barron, Elder   | 15. Mary A. Watson        |
| 4. Thos. P. Copes, Deacon    | 16. Mary A. Coattes       |
| 5. James Lindsay, Sen.       | 17. Mary E. Sibley        |
| 6. James Lindsay, Jun.       | 18. Mrs. E. Stribbling    |
| 7. N. H. Hidden              | 19. Mrs. Margt. Lindsay   |
| 8. Loxley Jacobs             | 20. Mrs. L. Graham        |
| 9. Beriah Graham             | 21. Miss E. D. Rosseter.  |
| 10. Jas. Barton Bates        | 22. Miss M. A. Smith      |
| 11. Geo. W. Call.            | 23. Miss A. Lindsay       |
| 22. Geo. C. Sibley.          |                           |

Absent about 20 members.

382

On motion of Mr. Watson, it was Resolved that the Rev. Asahel Munson be invited to take the charge of this church as settled Pastor. This resolution passed unanimously-- And on motion of Mr. Thos. Lindsay, Senl., it was ordered that this call be prosecuted in the prescribed way, by the Elders and Deacons. ---It was also ordered by this meeting, that the Elders and Deacons should call on all the absent members, and obtain their votes in relation to this call--And also to circulate a subscription Book for the Pastoral Support.

And then after prayer by Mr. Thomas Lindsay, Sen. the meeting was adjourned.

N. B. Barron, Clk.

Geo. C. Sibley, Chmn.

Note: Those members who were not present at the church meeting on the 14th, having been consulted, gave their consent to the call of Mr. Munson. Mem. Con.

Thursday, 15th April '41, By order of the Presbytery, Mr. Munson was today ordained, and formally INSTALLED Pastor of this church, in presence of a numerous congregation assembled in our church, The officiating ministers were Dr. Potts, Mr. Cowan and Mr. Barrett. Mr. Cowan preached the sermon. Mr. Barrett delivered the charge to the Pastor, and Dr. Potts to the people.

- 383 Mr. Chamberlain was also present and also Mr. Gilbreath, who preached at night. The church agreed to secure \$ \_\_\_\_\_ annually to Mr. Munson ( less or more ) subscriptions to be renewed from year to year.
- Thus was Rev. Asahel Munson duly installed, &c. The connection of Mr. M. with this church subsisted uninterruptedly and harmoniously 'till the 17th day of November 1844, when he preached his farewell sermon. On Sunday, the 3rd November, Mr. Munson announced his intention of applying to Presbytery ( which was to sit at Dardenne ch. on the 7th ) to be released from his pastoral charge here ( and which the Presbytery granted, the church making no objection ) Upon this announcement to the church and congregation, a suitable response was presented to Mr. Munson expressive of the kindest feelings towards him, and unfeigned thankfulness for his most faithful, pious labors whilst acting as our Pastor. Mr. Munson had become disheartened because there were no visible effects produced as he thought, under his ministrations; and declared that he thought it is his duty to go and labour somewhere else.
- 384 Many of the members regretted the course that this good and excellent Brother had determined to pursue; and many believe that there was indeed but little outward appearance of conviction under his preaching, yet that very much good seed had by him seen sown, which would in good time, spring up and bear fruit. On the 17th November 1844, Mr. Munson vacated his pastoral charge; but as his family would remain here till Spring, probably he would still preach occasionally in our church. He settled eventually in the Apple Creek Church, in Cape Girardeau County, and remains there at this time.
- Our church was visited as follows: 1st Dec. '44 by Rev. Daniel Baker, who was with us preaching day and night every day 'till the morning of the 5th when he left. Mr. B. left impression that will never be effaced. Dr. Potts came up the very next day ( the 7th ) purposely to continue the work commenced by Mr. Baker. He stayed 'till Saturday morning the 14th preaching day and night. On Sunday morning, the 15th, Mr. Sam'l Templeton came up by request of Dr. Potts to go on with the work. Mr. T. was only a transient visitor at St. Louis from Tennessee; but he willingly obeyed the call of Dr. Potts, cold and severe as the weather was. HE was with us 'till the morning of the 24th preaching day and night as the others had done. Thus it will be seen, that this church was almost incessantly open every day and night for 23 days. And it was almost uniformly crowded by the concourses of the people. Many persons were very seriously impressed with religious convictions, some converted, and added to the different churches, of whom ten connected with this church.
- 385 Jan. 4th 1845-Rev. Joseph Templeton came up from St. Louis and preached at night. On the next day, Sunday, he administered the sacrament of the Lord's Supper ( an unusual number partaking ) and preached three times.
- The church made a very strenuous effort in this month, to obtain the services for one year at least, of Rev. Dan'l. Baker. Mr. B. had agreed to come, but his church at Holly Springs refused positively to part with him, and we were of course obliged to give up our claim, tho' with the greatest reluctance.
- 386 6th February 1845-The Rev. Mr. Kuypers, an aged Presb. Minister from New York, came up from St. Louis by request of Dr. Potts to preach for us occasionally. He preached on the next Sabbath, the 9th, twice, to large and attentive congregations. His sermons were excellent. Altho' he has past his three score and ten years, and suffered whilst here with a violent cold. Mr. Kuypers was still vigorous and strong in his mental faculties. He was one of the staunch supporters and expounders of the OLD FASHIONED, OLD SCHOOL scriptural doctrines; eschewing most sincerely all New Schoolism of all kinds.
- On the 12th at night, Rev. Mr. Eustace preached for us. Mr. Munson occupied our pulpit on the 16th and 23rd two Sabbaths in succession. March 9th Mr. Candee preached twice. March 30th Mr. John Boal preached twice. April 6th. Mr. Munson preached in the morning and Dr. Fulton evening and at night. April 18th, 19, 20, Mr. Scovel was with us, and preached every night, and twice on Sunday.---The 20th---The attendance was always good.

387 May 31st, 1844-- The Rev. Mr. Lea (Thos. D. ) late of Alabama arrived here to-day with his wife--and appointed to preach to-morrow (Sabbath ) in our church. Mr. Lea has been very warmly recommended as a suitable Pastor of our church by Dr. Scovell, Dr. Potts-Dr. Goodrich & others. Sunday June 1st.--Mr. Lea preached this morning in our church. He and his wife are both suffering from ill health. Mr. L. is very weak, is affected with the bronchitis , and is scarcely able to preach, but thinks his health is improving. He preached twice on the 7th.--and on the next day, Sabbath, administered the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. The communicants quite as many as usual; and Mr. Lea conducted the whole thing, including and excellent sermon, with extraordinary dignity and solemnity. Mr. Lea preached again on Sunday the 15th.--and on the next day left for New York VIA the Lakes. The precarious health of Mr. L and his wife, obviously forbade his taking any pastoral charge for the present; and of course no overture was made for that purpose. He is a devoted and able Gospel minister, and evidently well qualified by his amiable demeanor, and devout conversation, for the pastoral office.

388 June 29th, Sabbath--Rev. F. S. Howe, Gen'l Agent of the American Sunday School Union, used out pulpit today, preaching and addressing the children of our Sunday Schools. The attendance very good--every one seemed much pleased with Mr. Howe, who is certainly a most efficient agent.

(Subsequently, the church, with entire unanimity, and very earnestly authorised the Session to invite Mr. Howe to come and be our pastor: it having been understood from him that he intended very soon to give up his agency. The invitation was warmly given--but the Board would not release him; and our church was again disappointed in obtaining a Pastor )

In July and August, our pulpit was used by Rev. Mr. Horrell and Rev. Mr. Britton, two Episcopal ministers--the attendance generally very good. The Session was still looking out and enquiring for a minister suitable for this church, aided by our steadfast friend Dr. Wm. Potts-- Meanwhile, we held our usual prayer meetings, Wednesday nights; and also met for singing and prayer & reading Sermons, on the Sabbaths.

389 Sunday, 19th October, 1845--- The Rev. \_\_\_\_\_ Beebe from New Jersey, & St. Louise, preached today in our ch. morning and afternoon--attendance pretty good. Sat. 25th. Mr. Beebe gave us a lecture preparatory to communion, appointed for to-morrow.

Sunday 26th.-- Services all day and at night. Mr. Beebe and Mr. Munson officiating. The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper administered--the attendance very good throughout the whole of the services. Mr. Beebe being a candidate for the ministerial office ( now vacant ) in this church; the Session thought fit to engage his services for two or three months as on trial, commencing the 19th of this month.

390 January 8th. 1846. Rev. Mr. Beebe left St. Charles today. --his services in our church terminated on Sunday the 4th inst. ( 12 Sabbaths ) for which he was paid \$103.75. Mr. B. appeared zealous and sincere in his duties: but he lacks mind and application; and is exceedingly extravagant in his personal wants and expenses--long before he took leave of us, the church and congregation ( with a few individuals excepted ) became heartily tired of him.--many believed that he was at times laboring under aberration of mind. During Mr. Beebe's stay here, we were favored with the visits of Mr. Munson--Mr. Finley--Mr. Lyon--Mr. Gibraath: all of whom preached for us.

Sat. 14th Feb.'y 1846. The Rev. Mr. Edw. W. Wright from La Fayette, Indiana, via St. Louis, came to St. Charles, with introductory and commendatory letters from Dr. Wm. S. Potts and others. Mr. W. is looking for a location; and proposes to sojourn with us two weeks or so, to ascertain if he will suit our church, and the church will suit him. He preached twice on the 15th, Sabbath, twice on the 22nd--and at night on the 27th, Friday. On Sunday, March 1st, he preached and administered sacrament of the Lord's Supper-- The weather extremely bad--and yet the attendance was good. The church and congregation generally well pleased with Mr. Wright. He is an experience minister of very respectable rank and standing--has a family and is in the vigour of life, and a very acceptable



391 preacher. He is willing to come to St. Charles for a secure salary of \$500 per ann., which is the smallest sum he can support his family, and educate his children. He left us on the 2nd of March for his family, with the understanding that the Elders were to forward to him an invitation, &c., PROVIDED the church and congregation should feel able and willing, to guarantee the salary of \$500. But it was found on enquiring that this could not be effected: and so the effort ceased. It must be stated here; that before Mr. Wright left St. Charles, a letter had been received by one of the Elders, Mr. Dick, from the Rev. Samuel B. Smith of Ohio, intimating a wish to come to Missouri, if a suitable situation was attainable; and making some enquiry of Mr. Dick. Mr. Smith was well known to Mr. Dick, and also to Mr. Gray, one of our members, both of whom spoke of him very favourably. And an informal invitation was sent to him to make us a visit as soon as he could conveniently. The result of this correspondence was, that on the 7th of May 1846 Mr. Smith arrived at St. Charles, ~~after Mr. Wright left~~ In the interim after Mr. Wright left, 'till Mr. Smith came, our pulpit was occasionally occupied by Mr. Watson of Dardenne, and Mr. Jones of Columbia, and once by 392 Mr. Hughes of Kentucky. Once also ( 26th April) morning and evening, by Mr. Scovell.

Sunday 10th May, 1846-- Rev. S. B. Smith commenced his ministerial labors in this church. He preached twice to a full congregation.

Saturday 6th June. Services preparatory to communion to-morrow--good attendance of members. After the religious services, the members present signified to the Elders, their unanimous desire for the engagement of Mr. Smith for a year--those members NOT present concurred unanimously it is believed, in the same desire, --as did also a large portion of the congregation.

Sunday 7th June-- There was communion, in the church, connected with the morning service, conducted by Mr. Smith--more than one hundred communicants participated. The church was crowded with lookers-on.

June 15th. Mr. Smith left St. Charles this morning for Ohio, to settle up his business there with the view of entering upon his ministerial relation with our church. He went in company with Rev. J. N. Candee, Agt. of Foreign Missions. Our church contributed \$44 to the objects of his Agency. 393

Sunday 5th July 1846--Rev. Mr. Peabody, Tract Agent, preached in this church afternoon. He had preached in the court house in the morning, and there took up a collection of about \$16. Contributed principally by some members of this church who happened there. No collection was taken up in the afternoon.

Monday 6th-- Rev. Mr. Smith returned today from Ohio in good health. Sunday 20th September-- Doctor Kane, Bible Agent, gave us an excellent discourse this afternoon, on the subject of his agency.

7th October, Dr. Potts preached at night--he was on his way to Presbytery at Dardenne church, to convene tomorrow. Sunday 18th October: Mr. Smith absent attending Synod at Columbia. Sat. 12th Decem: Service preparatory to communion tomorrow. Weather and streets very bad--yet pretty good attendance. Communion service attended nearly as well as usual.

Sunday 7th Febuary 1847-- Rev. I. W. Candee, agent for Board of Missouri, used our church to-day in his collection amounted to about FIFTY DOLLARS.

394 Sunday 28th, March '47 Mr. Watson officiates today in our church, having exchanged with Mr. Smith who went up yesterday to Dardenne ch.

After the morning service, the church by unanimous vote, agreed to invite or "call" Mr. Smith to take Pastoral charge of this church, thro' the usual channel, the Presbytery, and so ordered.

Thursday, 8th April, 1847- The Presbytery of St. Louis met today in our church--9 minister and 8 or 10 Elders in attendance. Rev. Mr. Pettigrew preached at night. Friday 9th: At night Rev. Mr. Watson of Dardenne preached to a large auditory, "on the duties of Ruling Elders" the subject assigned by the last Presbytery. Saturday 10th-Mr. Lyon preached at 11 a. m., and Mr. Pettigrew at night. Presbytery adjourned to-day.

In course of our sittings, our call to Mr. Smith to the pastoral office over this church, came up, and was in due form presented to him by the Presbytery, when he instantly refused to accept it. This sudden and most unexpected course of Mr. Smith, for which he assigned no satisfactory reason, astonished us all exceedingly, more especially as he took occasion to express his warm attachment to the church as a body, and individually without exception. He was willing to continue his connection with the church as formerly; but positively refused the office and responsibility as Pastor.

395

Sunday April 11th, 1847-- Dr. Potts preached in the morning and at night. The church crowded at both services--immediately after the services in the forenoon, the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper was administered. At least a hundred communicants partook. Mr. Watson & Mr. Pettigrew officiated--the church was very much crowded at night to hear Dr. Potts. None could have listened to that sermon, without being edified and instructed, and deeply impressed--its immediate effect was manifested by the deep silence that pervaded the crowded church.

396

Tuesday 27th April, '47-- at 8½ O'clock a. m. this day, Rev. S. B. Smith & Miss E. D. Rosseter ( of this church ) were united in marriage at Linden Wood by the Rev. Mr. Hill; and immediately after a cold collation, set out for St. Louis, on the way to northern parts of Illinois. Mr. Smith purposes settling in Illinois, if he can find a location to suit him, more retired than Saint Charles--for such a place he is supposed partly to have gone in search.

Friday 14th May 1847-- Rev. Mr. Smith and Lady returned to St. Charles, from their Illinois excursion--heartily glad to get safely back again.

Sunday, 16th--Mr Smith preached in the morning and at night. Attendance good as usual. Mr. Smith suffers very much from a chronic disease ( of the kidneys and bladder ) and is frequently disqualified from study and preaching, besides suffering much bodily pain--for this cause he wishes to avoid a position that involves much labour ( as he suppose this church does ) mental or bodily.

27th May--Mr. Smith being yet undecided whether or not to resume his labours here, tho' thinking it is most probable that he will not-- Another application was today made by letter to the Rev'd Daniel Baker of the Holly Springs for his services. Mr. Smith still continues to preach, and to conduct our prayer meetings here when he is able.

397

Sunday 13th June '47-- Mr. Smith preached this morning. He announced that he has now completed his engagement with our church and proposed leaving St. Charles this week for Iowa, where he expected to find a place more suitable for him--a few days after this announcement (16th) a letter was received from Rev. Dan'l Baker, in reply to our last application to him of 27th May, saying that he is not at liberty to leave the church at Holly Springs, and consequently cannot come to Saint Charles.

Mr. Smith did not locate himself in Iowa. He was again in our pulpit on Sunday, the 4th of July, and continued to preach regularly for us every Sunday, including the 25th inst.; about which time the Elders had made an engagement with him for another year. Mr. S. having at length determined to settle himself permanently in St. Charles--(It is proper to state here, that soon after the receipt of Mr. Baker's last letter; the Elders by advice of Dr. Potts, wrote to Rev. George Reid, a recent graduate of the New Albany Seminary, inviting him to visit St. Charles, with the view of employing him. Mr. Reid came upon that invitation and preached ( at night ) on the 25th, but as the Elders had, meanwhile, engaged Mr. Smith--Mr. Reid returned immediately to Indiana. )

398

December 31st. 1847. From the 25th July to the end of the year, the affairs of the church went on very smoothly. Mr. Smith preached regularly, sometimes assisted by Mr. Watson of Dardenne church. Nine persons were received into the church, on certificate, since January 1st--and two members died within that same time, viz: Mrs. Barron, wife of N. B. Barron, and Mrs. Alderson.

Sunday 28th May-1848--Mr. Smith announced today, the expiration of his annual engagement, and that the state of his health required him to rest, and that he should rest for two months to come-- he has preached very regularly for a year past.

During the months of Feb., Mch. and April, last, the members of the church manifested an unusual degree of religious feeling. The regular weekly prayer meetings in town were well attended, and frequent meeting for prayer and religious conversation was held in the county, principally in the Prairie, which were well attended; and marked with much deep feeling.

399 The year 1848, tho' an eventful year for the world at large, in relation to the religious and political struggles for freedom, has not been particularly marked in this church.

Mr. Smith re-commenced his regular preaching on Sunday the 13th August, and continued 'till the close of the year, with very little interruption, tho' his health was not entirely restored. Whilst he was obliged to desist from preaching ( from the 1st of June ) our pulpit was unoccupied for the most part, tho' occasionally we were favored with the service of Methodist ministers. And it should be noted that our Sabbath School has been attended to, more or less, the whole time. Mr. James Glanday died on the 5th Of June, the only death that has occurred in our church in 1848. One member was received on certificate, and one on examination. And six have been dismissed in good standing, to other churches.

Thursday 5th April, 1849-- The Rev. Dr. N. H. Hall came to St. Charles to-day agreeably to a long standing invitation from this church to make US a visit. He preached at night from the 1st clause of the 31st verse: 40th Ch., Isaiah-- good attendance.

400 Wednesday 11th April '49-- Dr. Hall left us this morning for Kentucky. He had intended to continue his meetings another week here, but was suddenly hurried to his family, having heard yesterday by letter, of the illness of his wife and daughter. Meetings were held day and night from last Thursday. After Dr. Hall left, Mr. Smith continued them Wednesday and Thursday nights. The church was usually well filled; often crowded, and the FEELING seemed to be intense and general, in the church and community. Dr. Potts was also with us on Saturday and Sunday, and preached, in the mornings of both those days-- a very large number of communicants celebrated the Lord's Supper on Sunday: Dr. Hall officiating. --ELEVEN persons professed conviction, and faith in the S<sup>c</sup>viour, and were received into communion with the church-- Many others, it is believe, were brought under conviction, and spiritually exercised, during these meetings.

Sunday 22nd July, '49-- Since Dr. Hall's visit nothing worthy of particular notice, has occurred in the church, except the death of a member, Mr. Sam'l H. Douglass died on the 12th inst.

401 Today our church was pretty well filled. The Sacrement of the Lord's Supper had been duly announced, and was administered ( the usual number of communicants ) attending ) immediately after the morning services. Mr Smith was assisted in all the services of yesterday and today by Mr. Booth, a licenciate of St. Louis Presbytery, and graduate from Princeton, who preached the preparatory sermons of yesterday and this morning: and also preached on Sunday night.

Monday 23rd July-- About the 20th of June, Mr. Smith notified the Elders, that in consideration of the very precarious state of his health, and his need of respite from the labors necessarily involved in an obligation to preach regularly to a church as its stated minister; he should retire from his present connection with this church, about the first August prox.; and requested them to look out for a minister to take his place. The Elders, accordingly advised with Dr. Potts on this subject, who recommended Mr. Booth, as a suitable successor of Mr. Smith. After hearing Mr. B. preach; and consulting several members, the Session made overture to him, to come and preach for us, as stated supply for some three or six months: with the view of more permanent connection ultimately--if all things suited.

402 Sunday, 29th July: Mr. Smith preached a very powerful sermon this morning from Hebrews IX<sup>o</sup>13-14--the attendance about as usual. At the conclusion of the services Mr. S. announced that he had now preached his last sermon under his last engagement with our church; and that the state of his health forbade his entering upon a new

engagement. He therefore desired the church and congregation to take measures to obtain the services of a minister in his place as soon as possible--that meanwhile he would continue to preach, whenever he felt able to do so, whilst the church might be without a minister; not binding himself however, to do so, by any positive promise.

Sunday 5th August: Mr. Smith preached this morning from Matthew 19th Chapter, and 23rd Verse--good attendance.

403 Sunday 12th August: Rev. Mr. Booth occupied our pulpit this morning, by appointment. His sermon, a very good one, was from the 17th Ver. 22nd Ch. Revelation. The effect on most of his hearers would probable have been better, if delivered without a too frequent reference to his manuscript. Mr. Booth has entered into an engagement with the Fe Fee church, St. Louis county--and of course declined the invitation tendered to him by the ruling Elders of this church.

Sunday 19th, August: Mr. Smith gave us an excellent sermon this morning, from Job. V, 24--"Thy tabernacle shall be in peace," the purport of the discourse was to point out the ways and means of Domestic peace and happiness.

Thursday 30th August, 1849: Our church is still entirely dependent, for preaching on the precarious services of Mr. Smith; without any definite prospect of obtaining a minister in his place. In fact, the Ruling Elders are making no effort at present to supply the place of Mr. Smith; but are evidently expecting that Mr. S's health is rapidly improving; they may be able to engage a continuance of his services for another year, from sometimes next autumn.

It should be noted that the Sunday School connected with this church, has been considerably increased, and the Library much enlarged this summer. The number of scholars that attend pretty regularly, is now upwards of ONE HUNDRED. But there are too few regular teachers, to do justice to the school.

There are now, at the close of the 31st year of this church 55 members ( all white ) in pretty regular attendance. (See the annexed list commencing on page 405)

404 I close this History with the following obituary:

DIED at his residence near St. Charles on the 26th day of June 1843, at 2 $\frac{1}{2}$  o'clock p. m., Mr. Thomas Lindsay, Sen. after an illness of a few weeks, during which he experience but little bodily pain. From my diary I copy the following, "June 21st--Visited Father Lindsay, find him very low,-- he is evidently fast approaching the end of his mortal career, altho' reduced to a mere shadow, having "scarcely any physical strength left, and no appetite, yet he sits most of the day "in his easy chair, rest quietly at night, complains of no bodily pain and retains "his mental faculties in all their usual strength." "Monday 26th at 2 $\frac{1}{2}$  O'Clk. p. m. "Mr Lindsay departed-- He literary fell asleep in Jesus "Mark the perfect man, and "behold the upright, for the end of that man is peace."

Mr. Lindsay was born in Perthshire, Scotland the 29th September 1771. He lived many years in So. Caroline, from whence he removed with his family to the place of his late residence in the year 1816. At the formation and organization of this church, 30th August 1818, he was chosen the first Elder; and continued to serve actively in that office till disabled by the sickness that terminated his life. His chief employments were literary, mostly theological--his BUSINESS, that of an agriculturalist: his habits, peaceful, kindly, hospitable, unostentatious. In his last Will he left the bulk of his Estate to the American Bible Society and the two Missionary Boards, and directed his slaves ( 21 ) to be sent to Siberia. Aug. 30th, 1849

G. C. S.

1843  
1721  
72

A list of all the Members received into the communion of the First Presbyterian Church of St. Charles, Missouri from its organization on the 30th August, 1818, to the 30th August, 1849

NO.	NAMES	WHEN & HOW RECEIVED				REMARKS
1	Thomas Lindsay, Sen.	August 30th, 1818	On certificate		Died 26 June, aged nearly 72	
2	John Bracken	Same	"	Same	Dismissed to Pennsylvania, not known when	
3	Theophilus Mc Peters	Same	"	Same	Dismissed to D rdenne, Sept 1819	
4	Margaret Lindsay	Same	"	Same	Wife of Nol. Died 15 Mch. 1832--Aged 40	
5	James Lindsay, Sen. #	Same	"	Same	( 1835	
6	Charlotte R. Lindsay	Same	"	Same	Wife of No.5-Died 17th Augt.	
7	Ebenezer Ayres	Same	"	Same	Removed to Iocway	
8	Deborah Ayres, his wife	Same	"	Same	Died in 182-	
9	Elizabeth Emmons	Same	"	Same	Died in 1825	
10	Sarah Thompson		Same	"	Dismisses in 1826 (1819	
11	Abigail Flint (Wife of Rev. Flint)		Same	"	Dismissed to Arkansas, 25 Mch	
12#	Elizabeth Hight		On Examination		Removed long since	
13.	Arch. Watson, Sen. Elder	March 25th, 1819	On certificate-		Died 5th Mch, 1826-Aged 65	
14	Martha Watson	Same	"	Same	Died 1824--Aged 56	
15	Johnson Watson	Same	"	Same	Removed in 1827	
16	Mary Watson	Same	"	Same	removed to Femme Osage, Several years since.	
17	Samuel S. Watson #	Same	"	Same		
18	William Watson	Same	"	Same	Removed June 1833	
19	Arch Watson, Jun	Same	"	Same	Died 7th Jany. 1826 -Aged 26	
20	William Fairbanks		"	Same	( Dismissed in 1822	
21	Olive Fairbanks		"	Same	( to Michigan	
22	John J. Wheeler		"	Same	Dismissed to N. Yk, in 1826.	
	(407-8)					
23	Lana C. Postle		"	Same	Dismissed 5 May, 1822	
24	Edward Peers-		"	Same	Dismissed in 1826	
25	Margaret Peers		"	Same	Died in Troy, July. 1827	
26	Abba Williams		"	Same	Died in 1828	
27	John January		"	Same	(Dismisses 26 April 1821	
28	Mrs. January		"	Same	(	
29	Abigail Farewell	1821	On examination		Dismissed to St. Louis, 1828	
30	Eliza Becket	"	"	"	Dismissed to S. Caroline, 1826	
31	Jane A. Becket	"	"	"	Died Aug. 28, 1833-( Marr'd Rev. C. S. Robinson, 1821)	
32	Judith Lewis	"	"	"	Dismissed 3rd Aug. 1829	
33	Emily Martin	"	"	"	Dismissed in 1828	
34	Margaret Thompson	"	"	"	Suspended in 1828	
35	David Bailgy	1820	On Certificate		Died at Troy, 1826-at peace	
36	Mrs. Woolover	1822	On Examin.		Died in 1822--A Christian	
37	Nancy Knott	1824	"	"	Suspended 1828	
38 #	Mary Wilson	1825	"	"	Dies as a Christian, death 10th July, 1835	
39#	Rebecca Palmer	"	"	"	Removed-time not known	
40#	Mrs. Millington	"	"	"	Died 13th July 1829	
41#	Mrs. Emma Garvin ##	"	"	"		
42	John Bunyan ( col.)	"	"	"	Went to Liberia, in 1844-good standing.	
43	Adeline E. Beck	November 1, 1826	"	"	Dismissed to St. Louis, 1832	
44	Alexander Garvin	March 17th, 1827	"	"	Died 20th April, 1832-Apparently prepared.	
45#	Philomela Emmons	August 11th "	"	"	Died	
46	Thomas P. Copes	30th August 1829	"	"	Suspended June 1844-died in Texas, 20 Feb. 1849-Aged 53 nearly	

	NAMES	WHEN & HOW RECEIVED					REMARKS
47	Mary A. Watson (Sam'l)#	30th Aug.	1829	On Exam.			
48	Mrs. Mary Machett	30th August, 1829		On certif.		died 20 July 1833-Aged 70- we trust a Christian	
49	Eliza P. Hartford-widow "	"	"	"	"	Daughter of #48, died as a Christian-11th July, 1833	
50	Pleasant Cayce	25th Decem., 1830	"	"	"	Withdrew with H. Chamberlain, Since dead.	
51	Newton F. Cayce	"	"	"	"	(Dismissed to Farmington, Aug.	
52	Louisa, his wife	"	"	"	"	(20th, 1833-both died near (Farmington in 1848	
53	Milton P. Cayce	"	"	"	"	Dismissed to Farmington, 12th April, 1833	
54	Mary Cayce	"	"	"	"	Married Thomas Glenday	
55	Janetta Cayce	"	"	"	"	Withdrew with H. Chamberlain	
56	Elisa Cayce	"	"	"	"	Marriet Rob't Spencer- No 77. 10th Nov. 1831	
57	Martha Cayce	"	"	"	"	Died 31 Mch. 1831-"to die is gain	
58	Ann V. Cayce	"	"	"	"	Died August 1834	
59	Mrs. Ann Wardlaw (H.H)	"	"	"	"	Withdrew with H. Chamberlain	
60	Marg't. Baldrige Mrs.	"	"	"	"		
61	Jane Naylor Mrs.	"	"	"	"	Died	
62	John Stuart	"	"	"	"	(Died 7 Sept. 1831	
63	Jane, his Wife	"	"	"	"	(Died 11 Sept. 1831	
64	Eliz. Bulloch, wid.	26 Feb. 1831		"	"	Dismissed to Palmyra ( mother &	
65	Jane R. Anderson, wid.	"	"	"	"	Dismissed to Palmyra (daughter, (both dead now	
66	Eliz. Smith	3 July	"	On Examination	"	Dismissed 25th June 1832	
67 #	Paul T. Ellis	"	"	On Examination	"	Dismissed 15th Jan'y 1832	
68	Mary Wilson	12 Novem.	"	On Certificate	"	Dismissed 25 June 1832	
69	Rebecca Koonts (wid)	25th Mch. 1832		On Examination	"	Dismissed 25th June 1832	
70	Sally Spencer (Wid#	"	"	"	"	Dismissed to Illinois, 10th Apr 11 1833	
71#	Mrs. Mary E. Sibley	"	"	"	"		
72#	Paulina C. Campbell (411-12)	"	"	"	"	Died, like a Christian- 25th July 1833 (tian	
73	Jane Beauchamp	"	"	"	"	Died 27, July, 1833-Like a Chris-	
74	Thomas Lindsay Jun	"	"	"	"	(Drowned in the Dardenne, June	
75	Margaret his Wife ##	"	"	"	"	( 19, 1841-son of 56. ( daughter of No. 41 & 42	
76#	Harriet Spencer	"	"	"	"	Dismissed 10 April, 1833-Dv. of 70	
77#	Robert Spencer	"	"	"	"	Suspended 1, Feb. 1836-son of 70	
78#	William Spencer	"	"	"	"	Dismissed 10 Ap. 1833-son of 70	
79#	Joseph Spencer	"	"	"	"	Dismissed 10 Ap. 1833-son of 70	
80#	Stephen Spencer	"	"	"	"	Dismissed 10 Ap. 1833-son of 70	
81	Emma Garvin, Miss	"	"	"	"	Died in peace-29th April, 1832	
82	James Lindsay Jun. ##	"	"	"	"	Son of 566	
83	Miss Ann Lindsay ##	"	"	"	"	Marr'd 166-25th Dec. 1833-See no 282-Daughter of 5-6	
84	Warren N. Goodell	"	"	"	"	Dismissed 1st Apr. 1832	
85#	Rachel M Henry	"	"	"	"	Dismissed 27th Mch. 1832	
86#	Susan Cayce	"	"	"	"	Dismissed in Apr. 1833-d. Of 50 and 57.	
87#	Laplate T. Ellis (Miss)	"	"	"	"	Removed without certificate.	
88	Martha I. Bailey	"	"	"	"	Withdrew with H. Chamberlain, removed to Dardenne	
89	Sally H. Bailey	"	"	"	"	Same same sam	
90	Alex. B. Campber	"	"	On Certificate	"	Same---- same---died in 1845	
91#	Elijah Mallerson	8th April 1832		On Examination	"	Both suspended 19th Octo. nei- ther was ever restored-(1834) Mr. M. became dissipated and	

92#	Marinda his wife	"	"	"	"	"	(went off in 1837-8
93#	Sally B. Parly	"	"	"	"	"	Removed in 1833 (acc't of her
94#	Evelina A. V. Griffith	"	"	"	"	"	Removed to Illinois-no further
95	Miss Pamela Garvin	"	"	"	"	"	Died 8th Octo., 1843
96	Miss Agnes Lindsay ##	"	"	"	"	"	Married No. 100-daughter of 5-6
97#	Miss Ann N. Sumner	"	"	"	"	"	Did not continue
(413-414 )							
98	John Spencer	8th April	1832	On Examination	Dismissed	10 April, 1833	
99#	Felix Koonts-	"	"	"	"	"	Returned again to the world.
100#	Matthews Watson	"	"	"	"	"	Dismissed 10 April, 1833
100#	Joseph A. Mc Knight##	"	"	"	"	"	( of her
102#	SALLY Beauchamp ( Col)	"	"	"	"	"	Ono knowledge what has become
103#	Enoch Steen	May 6th	"	"	"	"	(Dismissed in August 1833-Mr. S
104#	Mary, his wife	"	"	"	"	"	(became and officer in the USS.
105#							(army and was stationed up
							(in Missouri.
105#	Elix. Le Beaume	"	"	"	"	"	Went away in 1833 without
							certificate.
106	Ann Glenday Durfee##	"	"	"	"	"	Neice of No 1.
107	Eliab Jenkins	"	"	"	"	"	Died
108#	Miss Jane Shannon	"	"	"	"	"	(Dismissed in April 1833-Married
							(and removed to St. Louis county
109#	Miss Sarah Griffin	"	"	"	"	"	Dismissed in April, 1833
110	Elisah H. Jordan	"	"	"	"	"	(Dismissed to the Methodist ch.
#111	Ann, his Wife	"	"	"	"	"	(in Dec. 1840- Mr. J. died, in
							(connection with this ch. in APR
							(18--
112#	Emma Mallerson	"	"	"	"	"	Suspended 19th Oct. 1834-
							( A Roman Catholic )
113#	Moses B. Robbins	"	"	"	"	"	(Went back to the world--died
114#	Mary, his wife	"	"	"	"	"	(Never attended church. (ginia
115#	Ann A. Kent	"	"	"	"	"	Dismissed 15 Oct. 1832 to Vir-
116#	Jacob Beauchamp (col)	"	"	"	"	"	Gone away-dont know when or whe
117#	Rich. Lindsay (Col)	"	"	"	"	"	Died 10 the Mch. '46
118#	Letty Lindsay (col)	"	"	"	"	"	(Died 18th March 1838-Old Dick
							(died 10th Nov, 1846
119#	Williams Lindsay (col)	"	"	"	"	"	Went to Liberia in 1844-not
							in good standing.
120#	Jane Lindsay (col)	"	"	"	"	"	Went to Liberia-1844-in good
							standing.
121#	Diano Costho ( col)	"	"	"	"	"	gone away-not know when or when
122#	Danny Wilson ( col)	"	"	"	"	"	Went away from St. G. in 1832
							(world.
123#	Moses Hayes ( col)	"	"	"	"	"	Suspended-gone back to the w
124	Susanna Long-Widow	June 24th	"	"	"	"	Dismissed April 1833
125	Tabitha Fulton	"	"	"	"	Certificate	Died 24th June 1834-in
							Christian hope and peace.
126#	Sally H. Wardlaw, Mrs.	"	"	"	On Examination	Dismissed	Withdrew with H. Chamberlain -
							since dead.
127#	Miss Mary C. Wardlaw	"	"	"	"	"	Same--Since married & removed
128#	Catherine C. Long, Miss	"	"	"	"	"	Same-Marr'd No. 42-Since dead
129#	Miss Elix. P. Shannon	"	"	"	"	"	Dismisses in April 1833
130	" Sally Spencer	"	"	"	"	"	Dismisses in April 1833-d. of 7
131	" Rebecca Spencer	"	"	"	"	"	Dismissed in April 1833-d. of 70
132	" Ann M. Spencer	"	"	"	"	"	Dismissed in April 1833 " " "
134#	" Maria E. Foster	"	"	"	"	"	Died in August
135#	Edward Kent col.	"	"	"	"	"	Dismissed 15th Oc. 1832 tp Vir.

174							
135#	Lucretia Kent	Col	"	"	"	"	Dismissed 15 Octo. 1832- to Virginia.
136#	Milly Lindsay	"	"	"	"	"	Removed to St. Louis, is with Dr. Keit her owner.
137#	Mary Russell	"	"	"	"	"	Removed to St. Louis long ago.
138#	Martha Beuchamp	"	"	"	"	"	Gone back to Ky.--certif.
139	Nelly Collier	"	Octo.	"	"	"	Dismissed to St. Louis long since
140	James Hervey Black		Novem	"	"	"	One of Elders--Removed to Ark- ansaw in 1836
141	Ben'j. R. Wardlaw		Decem 30	1832	On Certificate		Withdrew with H. Chamberlain- Now of St. L. Co.
142	Robt. A. Cummins	"	"	"	"	"	Withdrew with H. Chamberlain and J. Gallaher.
143#	Mrs. Lucy Redmon	"	"	"	Examination		(Mother & daughter--they both ( withdrew with letters, to con- ( nect with Baptist ch.
144#	Miss Pamela Redmon	"	"	"	"	"	Dismissed in Aprail 1833
145	Mrs. Cooper	"	"	"	"	"	Withdrew with H. Chamberlain
146#	Miss Sarah Long		January 9th	1833	"	"	Removed.
147#	John J. Long ( 417-418 )	"	"	"	"	"	
148	Walker Stuart	"	"	"	"	"	Died 12th July-1833--willing to depart.
149	Walter Phillips	"	"	"	"	"	Died.
150	Miss Jane Stuart	"	"	"	Com Certificate		Married 90-22nd May, '34- Died 24th Aug. '34.
151#	Betty Bunyan (col)		March 31st	"	On Confession		Died ( wife of No 42 ) she died in peace.
152	Margaret Mc Clelland	"	"	"	On Certificate		Dismissed April, 1833
153	Marg't Graham-daughter	"	"	"	On Examination		Died in 1835
154#	Tannah Phillips	"	"	"	"	"	Nothing now known of her
155	Miss Isabella Lindsay	"	"	"	"	"	Married No 213
156#	" Celia Ann French	"	"	"	"	"	Dismissed Nov. 7, 1837--to Alton, Ill.
157#	" S. Selina French	"	"	"	"	"	Dismissed April 1839--Now insane in Illinois.
158	" Mary C. Griggin		April 28	"	"	"	Removed to Iowa
159	" Lucinda Mallerson	"	"	"	"	"	Suspended 19 Octo, 1834.
160	" Mrs. Frances Douglass	"	"	"	"	"	Removed, when and where not known.
161	Abigail Millington (col)	"	"	"	"	"	Gone back to the world
162	Sophy Early (col)	"	"	"	"	"	Dismissed in July '33
163	Elizah Sword	"	31	'33	"	"	Dismissed in August '33
164	Ann M. Williams	"	July 28th	"	"	"	Dismissed in August
165	Mrs Bailey	"	Sept. 21st	"	On Certificate		Withdrew with H. Chamberlain
166	John H. Stuart ##	"	July 20th	1834	On Examination		Dismissed in 1839--See no 281
167	Isaac Redmon ( col )	"	"	"	"	"	Suspended
168	Hugh H. Wardlaw	"	October 21,	"	"	"	Suspended 1st Feb., 1836)
169#	Miss Harriet White (	"	"	"	"	"	(Three Sisters, they all with- ( drew in 1840 with Rev. Jam. ( Gallaher.)
170#	" Eliz. White	"	"	"	"	"	
171#	" Mary Anna Whote	"	"	"	"	"	
172#	Sinai Simonds ( col)	"	"	"	"	"	Never attends church.





216	Mrs. Mary A. Coalter	January	1840	On Exam.	Dismissed to St. Louis, Oct. 1848
217	" Weaver	"	"	" "	Withdrew with Mr. Gallaher
218	Miss Ellis	"	"	" "	SAME Same
219#	Miss Sarah Boggs	"	"	" "	Withdrew to join Methodish Ch.
220	" Weaver	"	"	" "	Withdrew with Mr. Gallaher.
221#	Miss Nancy W. Skinner	"	"	" "	Dismissed to St. l. June 1840, Since marr'd. Died.
222	James Nesbit (423-424)	"	"	" "	Withdrew with Mr. Gallaher. Went to Iowa.
223	Harvey Gillespie	January	1840	" "	Withdrew with Mr. Gallaher. Removed from St. C. (came
224	Loxley Jacobs	"	"	" "	Removed to Delaware whence he
225	Mrs. Sarah Orrick (wid)	Novem. 8th	"	" "	Dismissed Apr. '42-Marr'd. D. Bishop, 8 Feb. '42-& Removed
226	Miss Miranda A. Smith	" "	"	" Cert.	Dismissed to Portland Ohio, 17 Sept. 1842
227	Beruah Graham	"Decem <sup>r</sup> 16th	"	" Exam.	(Removed to St. Louis county-
228	Lilly, his wife	" "	"	" "	and since to Shreveport. Let ( per dated June '41
229	George W. Call	" "	"	" "	Dismissed Mch. '41-Now resides in Florida.
230	Oliver Barron	" "	"	On Certif.	Died 26th Jan'y 1845
231#	Josh. Barton Bates	January 3 1841	"	Examination	Dismissed to St. Louis, 17th Sept. 1842
232	Noah H. Hidden	" 31, "	"	On Certificate	(Dismissed to Hillsboro, Mo.
233#	Phebe H, his wife	" " "	"	" "	(7th January 1844
234	Isaac A. Dick ##	April 17th "	"	" "	Now an Elder.
235	Betsy Ann, his wife ##	" " "	"	" "	
236	Miss Marg't Dick	" " "	"	Examination	Dismissed in May 1841
237	Wm. Clinton Thompson	June 6th "	"	Certificate	(Dismissed Octo. '48
238	Mary C. Thompson, his wife	" " "	"	" "	(Removed to Indianapolis, Mo.
239	Mrs. Jane Jones	Septem 5 "	"	Examination	Removed to Illinois
240	Mrs. Hannah Shepard wid. ##	" " "	"	" "	
241	Andrew Wilson	October 17 "	"	" "	Died 24 April 1842
242	Miss Avarilla Barnes	January 2 1842	"	Certificate	Dismissed, no in Indianapolis
243	Mrs. Serena A. Munson	May 8th "	"	" "	Dismissed
244	Mr. E. Root	August 21st "	"	" "	(All Dismissed to Columbia, 5th
245	Mrs. Laura Root, his wife	" " "	"	" "	(November, 1843- Since remov-
246	Miss Cornelia Root	" " "	"	" "	( ed to Milwaukee Wisconsin.
247	Mrs. B. Dayton, widow	" " "	"	" "	Mrs. Dayton is dead.
248#	Ebenezer N.O. Clough	August 21 "	"	Examination	Never attends commun. & VERY seldom at church.
249	Mrs. Sarah King, widow	Decem. 29, "	"	Certificate	Died 21 April, 1846
250	Mrs. Jane Lindsay (of #82) ##	" " "	"	" "	
251	John Maxwell	April 1st 1843	"	" "	(Mr. Maxwell & his wife, return
252	Elizabeth M, his wife	" " "	"	" "	(ed to Baltimore. In good stan-
253	Mrs. Nancy Douglas ##	" " "	"	" "	(ing after a very short stay.
254	Andrew King ##	" " "	"	Examination	
255	Mrs. Sarah Barron, wid. ##	June 29th	"	" "	Widow of No. 230
256	Ephraim Gray ##	Octo. 1st "	"	Certificate	
257	James Hood	Decem. 3 "	"	" "	Removed to St. Louis
258	John Jay Johns ## )	October 12 1844	"	" "	( Ages 23
259	Catherine John, his wife	" " "	"	" "	( Died 30th Aug., 1846
260#	Ben. A. Alderson ## )	Decem 21	"	Examination	
261#	Matilda, his wife )	" " "	"	" "	( Died 8th March, 1847
262	Alexander Garvin ##	" " "	"	" "	
263	Mrs. Nancy Ewing ##	" " "	"	" "	
264	Miss Sarah Jane Garvin ##	" " "	"	" "	Marr'd 290, 24 Mch. '47
265#	" Mary M. Lee	" " "	"	" "	Marr'd 11th Apr. '43. left St. C. 13th Aug. '49

266#	Miss Adelaide Adams	Decem. 21st, 1844	On Examination	Removed to the South
267#	# Jemima F. Adams##	" " "	" "	"
268#	" Jane Mary Rosseter	" " "	" "	Marr'd 291, Apr. 20, '48, A widow 12 July '49.
269#	Mrs. Frederica Mester##	January 14th, 1845	" "	"
270	Mrs. Nancy Blair	October 31st, "	" Certificate	Died-1848 at Dardenne (Commun.
271	Mrs. Nancy Murray##	" " "	" "	Very seldom at ch. Never at
272	Mrs. Eliza Lee	" " "	" "	Wife of Col. Lee, U. S. A., Left St. C. 27th Sept., 1848
<b>273 (427-428)</b>				
273	Miss Eliza Ott ##	" " "	" "	"
274	Mrs. Marg't J. Machett##	January 6th 1846	" "	( to Iowa
275	Miss Narcissa Ewing	" " "	" "	Dismissed 12 Apr '49, Marr'd gone
276	Mrs. Elizabeth Robbin##	" " "	" Examination	"
277	Mrs. Deborah Ball##	June 6th	" "	"
278	John Boal##	Decem 18th	" " Certificate	"
279	Joseph Woodruff			
280	Mrs. Sarah W., his wife	January 10th, 1847	" "	Dismissed to Ohio, 2 Apr. '48
281	John H. Stuart ##	Aprail 24th	" "	(Same as No 166.
282	Ann Stuart, His wife##	" " "	" "	(and No. 83
283	Mrs. Naomi Stonebraker##	" " "	" "	"
284	Joseph Blain	August 14th	" "	( Dismissed 7th Jan'y. '49
285	Mrs. Blain, his wife	" " "	" "	(
286	Mr. James Glenday	" " "	" "	(Died 5 June '48
287	Mrs. Mary G., his wife##	" " "	" "	(
288	Mrs. Jane A. Johns ""	March 18th 1848	" "	Daughter of 106
289	Mrs. Mary Case wid.##	October 14,"	" Examination	"
290	Robert AA Boal ##	January 7th 1849	" Certificate	"
291	Sam'l H. Douglass	" " "	" Examination	Died 12 July '49
292	Solomon Jenkins	" 9th	" "	(Dismissed and removed to
293#	Mrs. Jane Jenkins, hiswife	Apr. 12th	" "	(Fulton, Mo in July '49
294	Miss Francis Garvin	" " "	" "	"
295	" Margaret Lindsay##	" " "	" "	( Twin Daughters of
296	" Mary Lindsay ##	" " "	" "	( No. 74 & 75.
<b>(429-430)</b>				
297#	Mr. Lucian Case ##	April 12th 1849	" "	(Brother and Sisters. Children
298#	Miss Julia F. Case##	" " "	" "	(of 289
299#	Miss Martha A. Case##	" " "	" "	(
300#	" Julia Ann West	" " "	" "	An Orphan. Gone to Indianap- olis, Ind. with No. 237-238
301	" Margaret L. Durfee##	" " "	" "	Daughter of 106
302	" Naomi Barron ##	" " "	" "	"
303#	# Sarah Secker ##	" " "	" "	"
304	" Mary L. Blair##	July 15th	" "	"
305	John Stonebraker ##	March 19th 1848	" "	"
	Shd. have been #289.			

Note: Those marked # before the name were Baptised when, or at the time, they were publically received into the church.

August 30th 1849: On this day at the close of the thirty-first year of the church, out of the foregoing list of 303 members rec ( two are number twice John H. Stuart and wife Fifty-five those marked ## with red ink, remain as regular member and communicants in good standing.

431

## A

## ASSEMBLY Gen'l Pres. Ch.

- Rev. H. Chamberlain's appeal to-----215  
 Said Appeal docketed wrong on the Gen Assem's recods--55  
 The Appeal acted on in the Assembly --- 160  
 Complaint and Petition, to, of the 1st. Pres. Ch. of St. Charles----166  
 Final Decision on Mr. Chamberlain's Appeal---173

## B

- Baker, Rev. Daniel--384-385-396-397  
 Beebe, Rev. Mr.--389-390  
 Bed, Quilt Story--91-96  
 Boal, Robert-290-295-298-300-307-309-328-351-419  
 Boal, Rev. John---386  
 Booth, Rev. Mr.--401-402

## C

- Campbell, Alex. B-6-8-9-10-11-13-17-135-136-112-134-138-137-  
 Campbell, Rev. Alexander-370  
 Candee, Rev J. N.--386-393  
 Chamberlain, Rev. Hiram---Warned p. 7.  
 Visits St. Charles in 1828-preacher-dispute with Mr. Lindsay-invited to St. Charles-  
 refuses-his reasons, page 2. Not invited or named at the meeting Novem 1834; p. 3.  
 Visits St. C. Jan'y 1835, p. 5--proceedings respecting him-his friends elect him-  
 opposed, protest &c.-pages 6,7,8: His interview &c. with Rev. F. R. Gray--returns  
 to St. Charles--proceedings with his party &c.--p. 8-9-10-11. Approved of elect-  
 ion of the New Elders, by presiding at the meeting, and ordaining them, pages 11, 12.  
 432 Chamberlain, Rev. Hiram-- continued  
 He consent to act, and does act as a stated supply, p. 12. Appeals from the St.  
 Charles Presbytery to Synod, p. 15. Appeals from Synod to the Gen'l Assembly p. 18-  
 215. Publishes a pamphlet, p. 27-- Certain chgs. against him 29-30: Denies "Old  
 Schoolism" p. 32.-- his attacks on Rev. Mr. Cochran and T. P. Copes &c., and threat  
 against Rev. F. R. Gray, p. 32-publishes another pamphlet, his reasons thereof-p. 37.  
 (See index to the review of the above pamphlet, page 48 for reference to particular  
 passages, answered, &c. )  
 Complaint of Session against him to Presby. of St. Charles, p. 14-- Action of the  
 Presbytery thereon, p. 15--Prime object of his pursuit & perseverance 174-217-237  
 The same further illustrated-179 to 188. Rev. R. I. Breckenridge's opinion of his  
 course--164--Attends the Gen'l Ass'y of '38-his conduct, aim, etc-160-163--assembly's  
 decision--proper intention & effect of-160-161. He still persists in his object more  
 and more apparent-162-163. His strife with Mrs. Nelson-255 to 286. His final  
 departure from St. Charles 174  
 Church, First Pres. of St. Charles.  
 First Organizatio--by whom--members-convenant- etc. 359-361: Brief History to 28 Octo  
 1840--359 to 373. Vindicated from certian aspersions, 355,356: 359 to 373. Com-  
 plains to Presb'y of Rev. H. Chamberlain--14: Complains to the Gen'l Assembly of  
 same etc--166 to 172. Exhibit of cost, etc.-191- to 205--178  
 433 Cholera in St. Charles, etc. 37-73-78  
 Cayce, Pleasant--2-25-144  
 Cayce, Milton P.--41-42-144

## D

- Deed to church lot- The original & Record ~~where~~ to be found--179  
 "-- Some mistakes & difficulty about--179 to 181  
 Depose-- the meaning of, etc.--44-147 to 151  
 Durfee, Ann G.-- her testimony in part--124-127

## E

- Elders- Election of New Ones-9-10-12-13-138-144-146-147 to 151

- Emmons, B. Sen.--8-51-119-120-133-144  
 Eustace, Rev. Mr.----386  
 Exhibit--Cost of Building Church etc --189 to 205  
 FULTON, Rev. Dr.--386  
 GALLAHER, Rev. James  
 His call and election & subscription for -289-290-291  
 His first visit to the ch. after his electio 293  
 The call presented through the ~~xxxxxxx~~ Presby.--294  
 The call never accepted in any form--294-295  
 Demands the salary of subscription etc. --295  
 Opposes a church meeting---296  
 His remarks, etc. at the church meeting-324 to 327  
 Forms a new school church ---355  
 434 Notices of certain censorious remarks of his agt this church. etc. --355 to 357 & 364  
 His connection with this ch.--began --321--ceases 355.  
 GRAY, Rev. F. R.--invited by the ch. & congregation--3-4  
 The Invitation unanimous & cordial-112-114-119-120-131-133  
 His testimony before the Missouri Presb'y--122 to 124  
 His letter to the Session--206 to 213  
 His interview with Mr. Chamberlain--8-122  
 Graham, Dr.-- His testimony--112 to 134  
 Garvin, Amy, Her testimony--116 to 118  
 HALL, Rev. W. W. --p. 2-- Horrell, Rev. Mr. --388  
 HALL, Rev. N. H.--p. 399-400  
 HOWE, Rev. F. S.--388  
 KUPPERS, Rev. Mr.--386  
 LINDSAY, Thomas, 4-155-360-404  
 LOVEJOY, Rev. E-2-4-216-234 KEA, Rev. Mr. 387  
 MUNSON, REV. A--378-380-381-383-384-386-389  
 NICHOLS, Rev. Warren-2,3  
 NICOLL "Doctor"- Notices of--376 to 380  
 NOTES--relating to the Gallaher affair--305-306-307-308-309-323-323-351-357  
 OBITUARY-Notice of Mr. Thos. Lindsay, Sen--404  
 POTTS, Rev. Dr. Wm. S.--7-127-1393-395-384  
 PRESBYTERIES-21-22-23-14-15-103-394  
 SCOVELL, Rev. S.--Scoffers--Notice of--1520153  
 SIBLEY, G. C.-24-37--330 to 350. his testimony 94 to 97  
 SYNOD, of Missouri-17-18-226  
 ROBINSON, Rev. C. S.- 1: REID, Rev. George--397  
 TEMPLETON, Rev Sam'l and Joseph--384-385  
 TESTIMONY-Sibley's 94-Campbell's 113-114-134-137-138- Gray's 122-- Graham's 112-134  
 Jenkins 115-- Garvin's 116-- Dr. Wilson's 118-- Emmons' 119-121- Wardlaw's 115.  
 SMITH, Rev. SB. -391-392-393-394-395-396-397-403  
 Sunday School---403  
 WATSON, Rev. Thomas---391-394-395-396-398  
 Watson, Sam'l S.--6-7-10-14-15-16-18-115-140-141-143-144  
 Wardlaw, H. H.--192- to 205-6-189-132  
 Wright, Rev. E. W.--390  
 Williamson, Rev. Moses--293  
 Wood, Rev. Geo. C.--2-41-42-69-129  
 =====

APPENDIX-- its object etc.--358-373

Black, Jas H.--7-10-13-15

Cochran, Rev. W. C.--20-21-28-30

Charges--certain, agt. Rev. H. Chamberlain- 30-97

- 436 CHURCH-- The meeting of 13 June, 1834--page 289. The meeting 28th Apr. 1840-p. 298:  
 proceeding, 299 to 304-- the debate at the last named meeting 324-to 350. Opposition

of Messrs. Gallaher and Boal to the meeting 296-298-307.

Notes in relation to this meeting--- ~~322~~ to 350

"QUARRELSOME"-- This charge noticed----- 41-94-117-128-126-~~356~~-358-358 to 373

JORDAN-E. H.--- 7-14

PETITION--to invite Me. Chamberlain, etc.--10-43-133 to 135-139-236

PETTIGRUE- Rev. M---394-395

MAJORITIES- Not always to govern-15-130

"----- disputes about-8-18-33-69-140 to 144

-----

The foregoing index is very imperfect, but will be of SOME aid to the casual reader: and with the "Contents" at the commencement of this volume, and the INDEX at the 48th page, may be sufficient.

-----

The Presbyterian Church of St. Charles,  
Building their House of Worship on Lot No. 88  
Subscriptions - Lects. of Repts. and Expenditures.

Sometime in the year 1832 a portion of the people of St. Charles manifested some desire or willingness to build a Presbyterian church and to that end a subscription was opened and circulated. On the 9th of January 1833 the trustees of the Town of St. Charles thought fit to appropriate for the use of said Church "the east half of Town lot No. 88" to say "240 ft. in front on 3rd or High Street, and 150 ft. deep, French measure" and bounded as follows. "On the N. E. by Madison Street, on the N. W. by 3rd Street, on the S. E. by Clay St. and on the S. W. by the other half of the same lot". The Deed from said trustees to the Elders & Deacons of the Presbyterian Church of St. Charles, founded on the Ordinance of the Board of Trustees (which it recites at length) bears date the 26th Feb. 1833, and is recorded in the Recorder's office St. Charles in Book E. Page 190. The original Deed is to be found among the Archives of said Church.

The plan at first adopted was to build a House of worship on the Hill, on square No. 88 to be about 58 ft. long by 45 ft. wide, the foundation to be of stone, and the walls of brick, with 3 galleries, 2 above and below, to contain about 500 persons, and to cost about \$3000. -- It was afterwards determined however, at a Public Meeting, to reduce the size to a clear area not exceeding 40 feet square, still retaining the other parts of the plan except as to the Jews. Geo. C. Wibley and Ten W. Cardlaw were appointed to carry this new plan into effect and they immediately commenced it, had the foundation built, and contrived for the brick & other work. But the cholera came & put a stop to it, nor could the work be resumed for various reasons, till the Spring of 1837 a new subscription was then opened, & a more vigorous effort made to complete the building, the particulars of which will be related at large in a subsequent page of this Book.

As nearly as can now be done, the several subscriptions are given in the following pages, as originally made, so far as relates to their amount, conditions and payment, but the original subscription lists are all lost.

P. C. B.

-----

This list is carefully taken from the copies on file of the several subscription papers up to the 31st March 1837. The originals it is believed are all lost.

<u>Subscribers Names</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>Payments &amp; to whom made</u>	<u>Still due</u>	<u>Remarks</u>
Mary T. Wibley	20.00	20.00 Mrs. Lindsay Sen		
Seline French	10.00		10.00	
M. Jane Willington	1.00	1.00 Mrs. Lindsay Sen		
Jane A. Robinson	10.00	10.00 Done		
Frances Chart	1.00		1.00	
Eliza Porter	1.00		1.00	
Ann Lindsay	5.00	5.00 Mrs. Lindsay Sen		
Margaret Lindsay	5.00	5.00 Done		

<u>Subscribers Names</u>	<u>Dms Subd.</u>	<u>Payments &amp; to whom made</u>	<u>Still due</u>	<u>Remarks</u>
Isabella Lindsay	5.00	5.00		
Charlotte Lindsay	5.00	5.00		
Sarah W. Wardlaw	4.50	4.50		
Pamela A. Redmon	2.00		2.00	
Martha Beauchamp	1.00		1.00	
Jane Beauchamp	15.00		15.00	
Mary Jane Shannon	2.00		2.00	
Elizabeth Cooper	1.00		1.00	
Mary Mchett	2.00	2.00		Thos. Lindsay Sen
Olivia Hartford	2.00	2.00		Same
Sarah E. Gayce	1.00		1.00	
Pamela Marvin	2.00		2.00	
Catharine Long	5.00		5.00	paid in full
Sarah Long	5.00		5.00	paid in full
Amy Garvin	20.00	20.00		Thos. Lindsay Sen.
Rebecca Monte	25.00	25.00	25.00	T. P. Coyes paid
Tabitha Fulton	100.00	50.00	50.00	Thos. Lindsay Sen. dec.
Nelly Collier	1.00	1.00		Same
Lary Russell	1.00		1.00	
Mrs. Garvin	10.00	10.00		Thos. Lindsay Sen
Benj. R. Wardlaw	10.00	10.00		Same
Hugh H. Wardlaw	50.00		50.00	
James Lindsay Sen	10.00	10.00		Thos. Lindsay Sen
James Lindsay	5.00	5.00		Same
Michael Grater	5.00		5.00	
Dan. Beauchamp	1.00		1.00	
B. Pitter	1.00		1.00	
J. D. Williams	5.00		5.00	
Walker Stuart	10.00		10.00	
James Mchett	5.00	5.00		Thos. Lindsay Sen
Charles C. Mchett	5.00	5.00		Same
Walter Phillips	20.00	5.00	15.00	Thos Lindsay Sen
Kath. Watson	15.00	5.00	10.00	Same
Thos. J. Cunningham	10.00		10.00	
Nich. Kelly	2.00	2.00		Thos. Lindsay Sen
A. G. Robinson	5.00		5.00	
Schuyler B. Rice	1.00		1.00	
Leo. Murymon	10.00	10.00		Thos. Lindsay Sen
Osborn Mott	3.00		3.00	dec.
J. F. McNight	2.50		2.50	
F. Vavant	1.00		1.00	
Antoine James	1.00		1.00	
Neth Millington	15.00		15.00	
Sam L. Taylor	5.00	5.00		Thos. Lindsay Sen
Wm. H. Campbell	7.50	7.50		Thos. B. Coyes
Geo. J. Backland	5.00		5.00	
Alex. Garvin	1.00	1.00		Thos. Lindsay Sen.
Thos. L. Robinson, and	5.00	5.00		Same
Charles L. Robinson				
Robt. A. Cummins	5.00		5.00	paid in full
Wilton B. Gayce	5.00		5.00	
James H. Black	5.00	5.00		Thos. Lindsay Sen.
Thos. Lindsay Sen.	150.00	150.00		Same
James Lindsay Sen.	20.00	20.00		Same
Ben. R. Wardlaw	5.00	5.00		Same

(For T.S. Watson)



<u>Subscribers Names</u>	<u>Duns Subd.</u>	<u>Payments &amp; to whom made</u>	<u>Still due</u>	<u>Remarks</u>
Eliab Jenkins	5.00		5.00	
Thos. P. Copes	50.00	50.00 On account		
Andrew Wilson	50.00	50.00 In Trick		
John W. Redmon	5.00	5.00 In Tawling		
Wm. M. Campbell	15.00	15.00 10. to Lindsay	5. to Copes	
Wm. Christy	10.00		10.00	
Robert Spencer	5.00	5.00 Thos P. Copes		
Wendler Wres	5.00	5.00 Same		
T. D. Wres	5.00	5.00 Same		
Daniel Griffith	5.00	5.00 Thos. Lindsay Sen.		
Ann G. Burr	5.00		5.00	
John Bryan	2.00		2.00	
James L. White	5.00		5.00	
Montgomery Perry	20.00		20.00	conditional
Geo. Trinos	1.00		1.00	
Henry McLenney	5.00	2.50 Thos P. Copes	2.50	
Elijah Hallerson	20.00		20.00	
Pleasant Cayce	15.00	8.00	7.00	
Margaret Graham	5.00	2.50 Thos. Lindsay Sen	2.50	Rec.
Thos. Friday Jun.	10.00	5.00 Same	5.00	
Sam. J. Watson	5.00	5.00 Same		
Lewis Howell	2.95	2.95 Same		
Dr. Alexander	2.00	2.00 Same		Dec.
Mrs. Ann C. Durfee	2.50	2.50 Same		
Mrs. Farmer	2.00	2.00 Same		
James W. Black	2.50	2.50 Same		
Mrs. (Col'd woman)	10.00	10.00 Same		
Dr. Emmons & Dr. Gould	2.00	2.00 Thos P. Copes		
Dr. Wolton 5.00				
Mr. Smith & Bros. 10.00				
Mr. Ridgely 2.00				
Mr. W. Fumble 13.00				
W. Church 5.00				
Dr. Wood 5.00				
Dr. Farnsworth 5.00				
Congregation of Columbia S. Carolina, thro Mrs. Jane Robinson of St. Charles	229.00	229.00		Thos. Lindsay Sen.
Fopkins Stuart	10.00		10.00	
Ann C. Russell	5.00	5.00 Thos Lindsay Sen.		
Col. R. Preston, Duxenne	12.00	12.00 G. C. Sibley in Aug. 1837		
G. C. Sibley --- *	90.50	90.50 Thos. Lindsay Sen. & Others		
Thomas Lindsay Sen.	100.00	100.00 Same		

\* This Subc. was originally in a Horse, which subsequently sold, yielded the net sum of 90.50, of which G. C. Sibley collected & paid into the Ch. Treasury 75.05 See pages 16, 18, & 29, for full expl.

The following subscribed payable in materials or labour via.

<u>Subscribers Names</u>	<u>Sums Subd.</u>	<u>Payments &amp; to whom made</u>	<u>Still due</u>	<u>Remarks</u>
Eliab Jenkins	10.00		10.00	
Neil Lehong (a name)	25.00		25.00	Dead
Fugh V. Wardlaw	25.00		25.00	
Thomas P. Cowes	25.00	25.00 in materials		
Alexander B. Campbell	25.00		25.00	25. p.
William Brady	25.00		25.00	Dead
John T. Long	20.00		20.00	Paid in full
Robt. A. Cummins	12.00		12.00	Paid in full
	<u>167.00</u>	<u>25.00</u>	<u>142.00</u>	
Solomon Littley	5.00			Dec.
Stephen Fraser	5.00			
James Johns	5.00			
Fugh Redmon	5.00			
Oliver Simonds	5.00			
E. Brunells	1.00	1.00 in store work		
Lorenzo Holmes	1.00			
Nich. Janis	1.00			

The following List comprises all the Subscriptions, Donations and Contributions, since the 31st March 1837.

<u>Subscribers Names</u>	<u>Sum</u> <u>Subd.</u>	<u>Payments and to whom made</u>	<u>Remarks</u>
Geo. C. Sibley	250.00	250.00	G.C. Sibley, agt. & Treas.
Robert Doal	100.00		
Archibald Gamble	100.00	100.00	G.C. Sibley, agt. & Treas.
Thos. Lindsay Sen.	250.00	250.00	Same
Thos. P. Copes	250.00	250.00	Same & in materials
Wm. S. Watson	50.00	50.00	Same
Nathan. Patten	20.00	20.00	Same
C. T. Tuttle	5.00	5.00	Same
Alex. T. Douglass	5.00	5.00	Same in Nails
Isidell B. Powell	10.00	10.00	Same
Jn. Orrick	5.00	5.00	Same in Irish
Wm. C. McCluer	2.00		
Charles E. Coe	2.00		
Temulon Warman	5.00	5.00	
John Loggs	5.00	5.00	
J. Lime	2.00		
W. Orndorff	2.00	5.00	
Richl. Grater	2.00		
P. A. Stockslager	5.00	5.00	
Elisha F. Jordan	25.00		
Thos. Lindsay Jun	8.00	8.00	
Henry McKenney	2.00		
W. D. Eaton	5.00	5.00	
J. E. Dennis	5.00	5.00	
Jacob White	5.00		
W. Briscoe	5.00		
Wm. D. Fullerton	2.00		
J. B. Muschany	5.00		
Charles G. Rackett	4.00	4.00	
E. Vosti	5.00		
J. H. Fielding	10.00	10.00	
J. H. Ferguson	5.00	5.00	
T. Doal	5.00	5.00	
J. D. Shepard	3.00	3.00	
R. B.	5.00		
C. Barton	5.00	5.00	
Peter Grace	1.00	1.00	
Reynolds Wicksy	2.00	2.00	
Thos. J. Robbins	5.00	5.00	
	<u>1183.00</u>		

# Receipts

The following statement exhibits in detail the Receipts and Expenditures by C.C. Sibley, on account of the Church in Gladwin: the same agreeable to the terms of the subscription list of 31 March 1837 (see file) and the resolution of the Elders and Deacons passed on the first day of May 1837.

1837.

May 1	Rec.	From Mr. Wm. Lindsay Sen. (& rect. for) via. On acct. of his own subscription	100.00
		Amt. Mr. Robt Boal donation note & int.	104.00
			204.00
" 13	Rec.	From Wm. F. Jones on acct his subscription	20.00
" 25	"	from Thos. Lindsay Sen. (& rect. for) on acct his subsc.	50.00
" "	"	from same (& rect. for) Mr. John Haylor's subsc. full	5.00
June 5	"	from Arch. Gamble of St. Louis, his subscription in/	100.00
" "	"	from C.C. Sibley his subscription in full	250.00
" 28	"	from Wm. Lindsay Sen. (& rect. for) on acct of subsc.	50.00
" "	"	from Chas. F. Watson, his subscription in full	50.00
July 1	"	\$51. The amt. subscribed by sundry persons as part of a suitable offer to Rev. J. F. Fielding, but being thought too small a sum to be tendered to him. The principal contributors have authorized the transfer to this fund for the present. The contributors are Wm. Lindsay Sen. \$10. T. P. Cones \$10, C. F. Watson \$5., C. C. Sibley \$10., E. H. Jordan \$5., John Moore \$5., Thos. Lindsay Jun. \$5., Mrs. Durfee \$1., Dr. Preston \$1. The original subscription paper is on file.	51.00
July 19	Rec.	From Wm. Lindsay Sen, further on acct, his subscr.	10.00
" 20	"	from J. H. Dennis \$5., P. A. Stockslager \$5., T. Gendrick \$5., subscr.	13.00
" 21	Rec.	from Charles Richett \$4., John Boggs, \$5. subscr.	9.00
" 28	"	from Rev. J. F. Fielding his subscription	10.00
Aug. 17	"	from Mr. Haylor (Col. Preston's subscription) thro Mr. Cummins	15.00
Sept. 8	"	from Wm. Lindsay Sen. (& rect. for) as on loan	100.00
" "	"	from B. Eaton his subscription	5.00
" "	"	from Mr. Boal \$5., Mr. Ferguson \$5. paid over by Mr. C. F. Watson to Rt. Cummins on acct. & ch. to	10.00
" "	"	from Mr. Watson, the subscription of Mr. Burton	5.00
" 9	"	from Mr. Watson, \$5. for J. M. Sheppard subsc. and for a bal, due on old subscription of Wm. F. Watson	10.00
" 20	"	from Wm. Lindsay Jun. his subscription	8.00
Oct. 12	"	from Mr. Watson, subscr. of Richey, Robbins & Grace	8.00
" "	"	from Nath. Fatten, his subscription C.C. Sibley	20.00
Dec. 9	"	L. T. Powell, his subscription (p. to order)	10.00
" 14	"	from W. Lindsay Jr. on his joint note for Frederick	5.00
" 30	"	from W. Lindsay Sen. donation to pay R. A. Cummins *	20.00
" "	"	from W. F. Watson " " " "	10.00
" "	"	C. C. Sibley " " " "	5.00
" "	"	Thos. P. Cones " " " "	4.00
" "	"	from Jn. Haylor (price of a cow & calf) donation	11.00
		Amount carried forward-	1085.00

\* Mr. Cummins became clamorous & noisy abt. the little bal. due him & threatened to sue, wherefor Messrs. Lindsay, Watson, Cones & Sibley advanced the amt. above credited (their being no money in the Treasury) in order to pay him off.

1838		Carried forward --	1085.00
Jan. 8	Rec. from John Orrick his subscription		5.00
June 23	The following claims this day negotiated with Mr. Copes who purchased them from & settled with S.C. Sibley for them, viz:		
	Mr. Jas. Callahan's note for \$100. disc't. 1.50 --	98.50	} 183.21
	T.P. Copes & Jn. W. Long's note & int. thereon given to Mr. Thos. Lindsay Sen & by him to the Ch.	47.21	
	Amt. due by Messrs. T. Lindsay Sen, J.S.L. & T.I. Copes on their joint note to S.C. Sibley & given to the ch. by S.C.S. (See Page 29)	36.50	
Sept. 1	Rec. from S.C. Sibley for sundry nails and pieces of plank left in the church after the workmen had finished, supposed worth at most - - - - -		4.50
" "	for those sums rec. in settlement, from Mr. H.H. Wardlaw, & S.S. Watson on acct. of their joint notes to S.C. Sibley for a horse, & given by S.C. Sibley to the ch, viz:		
	from Mr. Watson	13 Dec. 1837 - - - - -	12.70
	from Mr. Wardlaw	1 June 1838 - - - - -	18.45
			<u>31.15</u>
			1308.86
Dec. 20	Rec. thro Mr. Shue, Mr. Tuttle subscription		5.00
" "	" from Shue 1.50 for a sand screen sold him		1.50
	" T. Warmon \$5., C. Pascoe \$2., J. Fine \$2., W.H. Pulkerson \$2., J. McCluer \$2., J.B. Buschang \$5.		
	\$16. in all collected for & paid over to E. Bourke & contra		16.00

Expenditures

1837

May 6	Paid	S. S. Watson for 21 H. Shingles at \$4.87 $\frac{1}{2}$	102.57 $\frac{1}{2}$
" "	"	Robt. A. Cummins, the Undertaker on acct.	45.00
" 13	"	Same	65.00
" 20	"	Same	100.00
" "	"	Manuel, Black Man, labor on lime kiln 4 D.	5.00
" 30	"	Robt H. Cummins on Acct	60.00
June 6	"	Same	60.00
" 9	"	Same	75.00
" 17	"	Same	100.00
" 28	"	Same (sent Him)	20.00
July 1	"	Same	30.00
" "	"	S. S. Watson Waggonage 21 H. Shingles from Alton 87 $\frac{1}{2}$ $\frac{1}{2}$	18.37 $\frac{1}{2}$
" 8	"	E. Fourhee on acct. of Plank had from him	25.50
" "	"	Waggonage of Brick, Lime, Land, Plank at sundry times	10.00
" 15	"	Robt. A. Cummins on Acct	50.00
" 27	"	Same	50.00
Aug. 7	"	Thos. Summers, order of Rt. A. Cummins	12.00
" 17	"	R. A. Cummins on Acct. in cash \$5. and \$12. in an order on Mr. Naylor for Col. Preston's subscription	17.00
" 19	"	Mr. Waggart, carpenter, verbal order of Mr. Cummins	30.00
Sept. 8	"	Rt. A. Cummins on acct. of Mr. Watson (see page opposite)	10.00
" 9	"	Mr. Waggart, carpenter on acct.	30.00
" 12	"	Mr. Cummins order fav. of Peter Durawa	2.00
" 13	"	L. J. Chauvin's acct. for Plank (see file)	124.12 $\frac{1}{2}$
" 25	"	T. Yosti's Bill for nails (on file)	29.75
Oct. 4	"	Mr. Waggart, carpenter on acct.	10.00
" 13	"	Mr. Waggart, carpenter on acct	15.00
" 14	"	Hawling plank laths.	2.50
" 24	"	Norman Thomas 8 H. laths \$2.75 rect. on file	22.00
" 27	"	Wm. Echarts Acct. (on file) for 2000 ft. plank ch. at \$4 $\frac{1}{2}$ per hund. & int. for seats for the/	91.05
Nov. 4	"	Mr. Waggart, carpenter, on acct.	20.00
Dec. 9	"	Manuel, Blk. Man, making mortar	10.00
1838			
Jan. 3	"	Henry a Dutchman, for labor as tender on the masons last summer, balance due him on acct.	6.50
" 8	"	Paid B. & J. Orrick's Acct for 8.767 H. Brick had from them for the church, bill & rect. on file	87.67
Jan. 25	"	Robt. A. Cummins Acct, Bal, due him as per Statment. Rec. pages 23, 24, 25, & duplicates on file	52.42 $\frac{1}{2}$
Feb. 17	"	L. Waggart carpenter, on acct. rect.	40.00
March 8	"	Brant & Robbins bill for painting, on file	44.00
" 9	"	L. Waggarts bill (on file) Balance in full	70.46 $\frac{1}{2}$
" "	"	A. T. Douglass bill on file, for stove pipe	24.57
April 16	"	D. Weaver's bill, on file, for turning posts for pulpit	4.50
" "	"	for 20 -- stove pipe furnished in Feb. by S. C. S.	7.50
Sept. 13	"	Burd, Tilden & Co. of St. Louis, their acct for making and putting up the gatters, heads in Augt. '37 (see their acct. on file)	64.25
Dec. 1	"	3 latches for the church door at 50 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.50
"	"	Plastering the church see page 51.	174.00
"	"	John Easterbrooks bal. due to him for work done on the church under Cummins. see Cummins' statment. on file	31.50

Amount carried forward. 1848.55 $\frac{1}{2}$

Expenditures

1838

\$18 48.55 1/2  
.87 1/2

Dec. 20	Paid for glass and putty for repairs, the church	16.00
"	to E. Fourhee as per contra. it being on acct of his bill for plank furnished for the church	

-----

An acct. of Monies paid to Robt. A. Cummins carpenter by G.C.Sibley at sundry times as in conformity with the contract & agreemt. made with him 26th Apr. 1837 on file, which said Cummins is to account for agreeably to the stipulation in said contract.

<u>When pd.</u>	<u>Sums</u>	<u>Paid</u>	<u>Remarks</u>
1837			
May 6	Forty five dollars	45.00	Paid to himself in person
" 13	Sixty five dollars	65.00	same same (\$30. thro. Mr. Copea)
" 20	One Hundred dollars	100.00	same same
" 30	Sixty dollars	60.00	Same Same
June 6	Sixty Dollars	60.00	Same Same
" 9	Seventy five dollars	75.00	Same Same
" 17	One Hundred dollars	100.00	Same Same
" 28	Twenty dollars	20.00	Same Same
July 1	Thirty dollars	30.00	Same Same
" 15	Fifty dollars	50.00	Same Same
" 27	Fifty dollars	50.00	Same Same
Aug. 7	Twelve Dollars	12.00	Paid his order to Thomas Summers
" 17	Seventeen dollars	17.00	Paid to him in person
" 19	Thirty Dollars	30.00	Paid him thro Mr. Taggart Watson
Sept. 8	Ten dollars	10.00	Paid him (some days since) thro. Mr. SS./
" 9	Thirty Dollars	30.00	Paid him thro Mr. Taggart
" 12	Two dollars	2.00	Paid his order to Peter Durawa.
		\$756.00	

In all Seven Hundred & fifty six dols. received from G. C. Sibley as above stated, also received in Apr. & May \$18.25 dols from Mr. Copes, making the whole sum received \$ Seven Hundred & Seventy four & 25 cents.

-----

I acknowledge to have rec. from G.C.Sibley Seven Hundred & fifty six dollars as above stated, and also on the same acct. from Mr. Thos P.Copes, the further sum of eighteen 25/100 Dollars, making in the whole Seven Hundred Seventy and four 25/100 Dollars that I have rec. & am to acct. for up to Sept. 12, 1837.

(signed duplicate) R.A. Cummins.

The Presbyterian Church of St. Charles in Acct. current with Robert A. Cummins.

Dr.

Dr.

1837.

1837

Sept. For his personal services on Sept. (See contractor file) from 26 April last employed 93 $\frac{1}{2}$  days at \$2.50 per day - - - - - \$235.75  
 For amt. paid Brick masons statement rendered - - 148.00  
 For amt. paid Underwood Easterbrooks, weaver & Taggart, carpenters, for services, statemt. rendered - - - - - 282.25  
 For Amt. paid laborers (tenders on the masons - - 73.37 $\frac{1}{2}$   
 For amt. paid Sheppard on acct. his bill of lumber 40.00  
 For amt sundry contingent expenses incurred & paid for lime, lumber, girder, iron bands, nails, poles, labor, hawling, barrel, rope pr. statemt rend. in detail 69.07 $\frac{1}{2}$   
 Amt. paid Conoyer \$3.12, Jas. Long \$2 $\frac{1}{2}$ , Bangs \$1.50 - 7.12 $\frac{1}{2}$

Sept. By amt. of cash rec. from G.C. Sibley pr. statement annex - - - - - 750.00  
 By amt. ditto from Mr. Copes - 18.25  
 By Amt. value of refuse brick applied to his own use - - - - - 5.00  
 By amt. value of pine poles 1.00  
 By amt. rec. thro A.D. Campbell - - - - - 5.00  
 By amt. for completing unfinished work charged full price in former acct. 15.00  
 By amt. due on old acct settled in Apr. last .90

1838

Jn. 25 - Balance due Mr. Cummins 801.15  
 52.42 $\frac{1}{2}$

853.57 $\frac{1}{2}$

853.57 $\frac{1}{2}$

Linden Wood Jany. 25, 1838. Bal of Contra. rot. down 52.42 $\frac{1}{2}$  which balance of Fifty two Dollars and 42 $\frac{1}{2}$  cents I have this day received from G.C. Sibley on the part of the Church in full of this & all other accts. against said church to the present day.

(signed R.A. Cummins  
 duplicates)



The Presbyterian Church of St. Charles Dr.  
To Jarman Taggart.

For services, as carpenter, from July 10th to 16th Sept. 1837. inclusive, in which time worked 54 $\frac{1}{2}$ days at 1.75 as allowed by Mr. Cummins the Supt. - - - - -	95.37 $\frac{1}{2}$
For services 60 $\frac{1}{2}$ days subsequently to 16th Sept. last making Pulpit and steps and doing other work inside of the building at 1.81 $\frac{1}{2}$ day as allowed by Messrs. Powrhe & Long referees (See file) - - - - -	91.53
For making 5 Transoms, circular sash at 5. - - - - -	25.00
" " 2 " " 3 frames for them at 7. - - - - -	14.00
" plank & sand paper furnished - - - - -	1.56
	<u>227.46<math>\frac{1}{2}</math></u>
Dr. By cash rec, from G.C.S. & Mr. Cope at sundry times	157.00
Balance due this 19th Mch. '38 - - - - -	<u>70.46<math>\frac{1}{2}</math></u>

Linden Wood March 19th 1838. On final Settlement with G.C. Sibley  
this day rec. in his note, the above bal. of seventy dolls. & 46 $\frac{1}{2}$   
in full

Jarman Taggart.

- - - - -

Note. On Pages 16 & 18 the following sums are credited as having  
been rec. by me into the Treasury and accounted for accordingly viz:

From Jas. Lindsay Sen, P. 16 on the 14th Dec. '37 - - - - -	35.00
From G.S. Watson 15th Dec. '37 - - - - -	12.70
" H.H. Wardlaw 1st June '38 - - - - -	18.45
" T.F. Copes & Thos. Lindsay Sen. - - - - -	36.90
	<u>68.05</u>
	72.05

and on Page 7 there is also a note of this with the addition  
of this sum rec. by Mr. J. Lindsay Sen, to my credit on the  
same acct. - - - - - 7.50

Which is my original subscription in 1832, the whole of 90.55  
which has been at length with considerable trouble collected  
and paid in, as credited 375 05/100 by myself and 17 50/100  
by Mr. Lindsay. The source from which this 90 50/100 was  
devised was the avails of a fine Horse, supposed to be worth several  
Hund. dollars, that I gave to the officers of the church in 1832 to  
be sold & the proceeds applied to the building of the ch. The sale  
was neglected & the horse left on my hands a whole year to feed  
and take care of. In the summer of '33 I had him sold at auction,  
when Messrs H.H. Wardlaw, Thos. Lindsay Sen., Thos. P. Copes, G.S.  
Watson & Jas. Lindsay Sen. became the purchasers at the price of  
375. and gave me their joint notes, which notes with the Int. accruing  
thereon, being all collected, the amt is at length brot into acct.  
and credited as above stated. That collected by Mr. Lindsay (17.50)  
was expended previously to my agency as Treasurer, July 31, '38.

G.C. Sibley.

The Presbyterian Church of St. Charles

To Michael Shue Dr.

For Plaistering the inside of the Church on the Hill in 1837, the whole work measuring 700 sqr. yards as meas. by Cummins at 22 cents pr. yard - - - - -	\$154.00
For straightening the ceilings, 50 squares - - - - -	15.00
For Plaistering the fire walls, on the roof - - - - -	4.00
For amt. paid a labourer - - - - -	1.00
	<hr/>
	\$174.00

Linden Wood December 20th 1838. Received from C.C. Sibley  
the above One Hundred & Seventy four Dollars on the part of the  
Church, in full discharge of this account.

Michael Shue.