

relation to the preaching, it would have been at once kind and decorous, and might have led to beneficial results, and averted the evils that grew out of the hostility engendered by the opposite course. Sympathetic feeling and kindly affection dictated this course. How came the leaders of Granville Street Church to reject that course when proposed by one of the deacons?

Why was the dictate of natural justice violated, and the advice of the deacon rejected, as regarded the taking of evidence in Dr. Pryor's absence?

How is the opposition to a Council, in the first instance, notwithstanding the agreements of the deacons to be accounted for, when a Council at that time might have averted such a fearful amount of mischief?

Why the rejection of the Council on the Vass matter?

Why the uncalled-for renewal of the charge of immorality, at the expense of the feelings of the friends of Dr. Pryor in the Church?

Why reject the decision of the Council, when a respectful deference to it would have prevented so great an amount of mischief?

Why aim to lacerate the feelings of Dr. Pryor and his friends, by publishing distorted and partial statements of the evidence?

There is one apparent exception; they had the power to have gone further than they did, in the resolution of May 10th. It must be presumed that their action was then conscientious. How was it that they repented of this one only act, that had the aspect of consideration for the pastor, and sought, and finally did push the matter to its utmost extremity? Were they ashamed that there should be a single instance in which, two courses being open, they had not pursued the harsher?

Reflect on the striking fact, that in every stage, and they were many, the harsher course was invariably pursued, except in one, and in that one they retracted.

The inevitable inferences to be derived from these two analyses of the facts are worth far more than their strained arguments, in determining whether Granville Street Church acted with wisdom and tenderness in dealing with their late pastor.

In connection with this I will make a further remark, to which I beg the most serious consideration: No one who makes himself acquainted with the facts, can fail to perceive that there was a period when the Church,—its leaders, of course, I mean here,—did assume a position of hostility and antagonism to Dr. Pryor, and had sunk the character of judges in that of hostile litigants. From that period, any act done by them, in the character of judges, was unauthorized, inconsistent, and nugatory. That period had surely arrived at the Association last June; it had assuredly arrived during the negotiations for a Council. That it had arrived during the proceedings before the Council, no one then present can doubt. The fact to which I allude, is indisputably shewn in the records and acts of the Church. When, therefore, after the decision of the Council, the Church undertook to pass on Dr. Pryor's moral character and conduct, they were disqualified for the office they assumed, for two reasons:—