

Insert this after the June
Geo. W. Olney, Jr. Meeting
Positions

When the Church decided that the
Congregation should be divided ^{in 1869} on
account of its increased numbers, and
thus have two congregations the
great ~~map of the western border~~ ^{first}
The next question arose. Shall the
second Congregation Organize itself
into an independent Congregation
having its own Officers and doing
its own work. This question produced
a warm discussion and some feeling.
Some of the prominent ^{brethren} urged that
there ought to be more than ^{one} Organ-
ized Church in any City, since we
have no Scriptural proof that in
the Apostolic times there existed a
plurality. Myself with brother
Barnes and others opposed such a move as
not only ~~anti~~ ^{anti} Scriptural, but
directly against our whole practice
as a people, and a direct move
toward ~~the~~ Diocesan Episcopacy

Not only that but in direct opposition
 to our consciences. The vote was
 however taken when there were 26 for
 the New Order, and 22 against it,
 the larger part of the congregation
 giving No vote. I determined
 that it was not my duty to yield
 to a measure which in my judg-
 ment leads an ecclesiastical
 hierarchy. Some of the leaders in
 its favor finding that their action
 had produced more serious
 trouble than was expected. Said that
 if we would wait until the 2nd
 congregation would have time
 to hold a permanent home that
 a change would be made and
 an organization would take
 place, I agreed to do so. After
 waiting for 14 months, and the
 proposed home was brought
 forward that no such change

was likely to take place, and decided
 that it would be right to create a
 second church upon the old platform
 and steps were taken to effect it
 in the Spring of 1871. After such
 an organization was created the
 mainstreet ~~branch~~ ^{elder} in order to
 effect a reconciliation proposed
 as follows: 1. That they would
 call the whole brotherhood of
 their two congregations together
 and advise that a separate Org-
 anization at Broadway be ^{created} advised
 2. That if desired, that both the pre-
 chers & the Elders would resign ~~if~~
~~desired~~, and that a new election
 be had. To this I was ready to
 respond favorably ^{save the resignation} with one more
 of the acting Committee, decid-
 ing however to veto for the resign-
 ations proposed on the ground of
 action was not so much on accou-
 nt

I felt that it was ³¹ my duty to accept the offer of the Elders, so far as the New Organization was concerned as that was the only Scriptural ground of my action, but declined to ask that the officers resign not being able to see the necessity of it ~~the other~~

Bro D. C. Goodle fully agreed with me. This was in May or the last of April. I labored to induce brother Korman and ~~Pickett~~ ^{Pickett} to consent. Finding ^{them} determined to accept of no terms of reconciliation, I felt that I could do them no good. I also became well convinced that the ~~most~~ ^{many} of them who had withdrawn were ^{one} moved by very different principles than those which prompted my action. Consequently I withdrew from ^{them} advising some of them that I could no longer ^{work} with them.

In June when the Church passed a sentence ^{having acted} of ~~disorderly~~

He luckily stated that I had one conf-
 session of wrong to make, and urged
 that the Church had also violated
 the law of love. It is enough to
 say that both the Church and
 myself were entirely satisfied
 with the mutual explanation
 and peace was made. And I had
 no doubt either then, or now
 that either brother or pursued the
 same course our present troubles
 would not exist. May our
 God ever inspire us to strive
 for the unity of the spirit in
 the bond of love.

L W Elley

At the June meeting there were mutual
explanations made by L. W. Elley and
~~Mr.~~ Elder Robt. Milligan on behalf
of himself & the Church in reference
to the Original difficulty which
was received as satisfactory
by all concerned and thus placed
L. W. Elley again with the Church

Respectfully,
L. W. Elley