

VIII. The rejection of the decision of the Council.

IX. The violations of truth on the part of the Church.

X. The exclusion of several members in good standing, who, from causes that rendered their remaining impossible, had withdrawn.

My preliminary duty is to call your attention to the Reply made by Granville Street Church to the charges contained in my Letter, that you may judge how those charges stand affected by the Reply, and whether sufficient answers have been given, or extenuation shewn; or whether the first offence has been aggravated by evasion, misrepresentation, and falsehood.

I.—The first charge related to the exclusion of the Rev. Dr. Pryor from the pulpit, in the inception of the proceedings, and the disastrous consequences that resulted. See Letter, pages 7, 8.

It is not denied that Mr. James Johnstone's proposal, "that the pastor should not be interfered with in the then immature state of the case," was put down on the Friday evening meeting, and that my proposal, that "some of the deacons should next morning visit Dr. Pryor, ascertain his views, and act as far as possible in harmony," was also overruled.

These tacit admissions show, in a negative form, the determination and state of mind of the meeting; and their Church record (Reply, Appendix, page 40) shows their decision in its affirmative form. "After the close of the meeting several of the brethren consulted together and concluded that it would be inexpedient that Dr. Pryor should preach on the following Lord's day, and requested Deacon Selden to communicate with Dr. Pryor on the subject, and to invite Rev. D. M. Welton to occupy the pulpit."

Notwithstanding these plain and undisputed facts, Granville Street Church hazards the assertion that Dr. Pryor "was consulted, and was told what was 'proposed' to be done with his 'concurrence.'" This pretence is fabricated out of Mr. Selden's note, and Dr. Pryor's reply. It seems, however, but reasonable to expect some explanation here. We require to be told how it happened that Mr. Selden, acting on a decision agreed upon at 11 o'clock at night, in so determinate a manner, should early next morning have taken it upon himself to modify it so essentially as to allow Dr. Pryor's preaching or not preaching on the following day to depend on Dr. P's. own concurrence.

No explanation is given. Without an attempt to reconcile this glaring inconsistency between the determination of the meeting on Friday night, and the alleged action of Mr. Selden on Saturday morning, the notes that passed between Mr. Selden and Dr. Pryor are held up, and the Church, in the reproachful tone of injured innocence, exclaims:—"In the light of these written documents, what can you mean by the rejection of the proposal to consult Dr. Pryor before acting?" (Reply, page 9.)

What I meant they well knew. I meant what they have not denied, their rejection of my proposal, "that some of the deacons should next morning visit Dr. Pryor, ascertain his views, and act as far as possible in harmony." What I *now* mean shall be equally clear. I mean to