

POSTSCRIPT.

While the Memorial was passing through the press, an Extra of the *Christian Messenger* of the 3rd inst., came under my notice, containing a letter from the Rev. John Davis, one of the Council, dated April 8, 1868. It is satisfactory to me that all that is in the foregoing paper respecting the Church's rejection of the Council's decision was written as it now stands, before the appearance of the Extra. Did I desire to answer Mr. Davis' letter, I do not know that I could do so much more directly than is done in the remarks on the subject, written while ignorant of its existence.

When I wrote the postscript to my Letter to the Church, and my remarks in this Memorial, I believed that an honest and intelligent man could not in a solemn judgment intentionally write one thing while he meant something else. I did not believe he could write—"in my opinion Dr. Pryor is not guilty of immorality as charged," or—"I acquit him of dishonest and fraudulent intention," &c., unless those declarations truthfully expressed his honest belief. As little could I imagine that an honest man, having acquitted Dr. Pryor of dishonest and fraudulent intention, and having recommended the Church to reconsider the action on that charge, by which they had suspended him from fellowship, could have made that recommendation with any but one purpose,—that is, that the Church, accepting the judgment of acquittal, should rescind their sentence of condemnation. When, therefore, the *Christian Messenger* affirmed that there were members of the Council who gave a construction to the decision opposed to these self-evident truths, the necessary alternative was that either the statement was untrue, or, that members of the Council had acted as fools, or as knaves. I believed the former to be more likely. From Mr. Davis' letter, I understand that I was mistaken. I, therefore, apologize to Mr. Selden, for having believed that it was more likely that he should say what was untrue, than that the Rev. Mr. Davis, as one of the Councilors, should "be fool" or "be knave" himself. It is, however, to be remarked, that the letter has not been produced, which, in November, 1867, Mr. Selden said he had received, and which was the occasion of my remarks. A letter written in April, 1868, by Mr. Davis, may be sufficient to place the Reverend gentleman in the category he seems emulous of occupying, but does not meet the case as between Mr. Selden and me.

Mr. Davis confuses things essentially different, and the venom, in his observations, is derived from that confusion. He confuses the charges of *immorality* and *fraud*, with the charges of *want of discretion* and *incompetency*, etc.