

d to such a rashness of  
t, if in oppo-  
golden rule,  
innocence,  
ibilities that  
s of human-  
licated on a  
principles of  
self-suffici-  
ion, can be

eling, as to  
ded from a  
of this case,  
se to with-  
ged charge  
immorality,  
they did not  
ility of two  
dd declared,  
guilty?  
bute of the

dismissal  
seek some  
self, during  
, as far as  
s this not  
se passions  
f Christian  
ision of a  
passion, be  
ful hazard,  
emning an  
vengeance  
language to  
ly Church

ng of the  
lty of dis-  
a manner  
e fruit of  
emptuous  
s indiffer-

clare their  
isters and

laymen, including the six elected by the Church, say, under their own hands, that after prolonged, patient, and prayerful attention, they are of opinion that Dr. Pryor is "not guilty" of immorality as charged, and that they "acquit" him of fraudulent intention in his dealings as agent, &c.

The Church has given its own interpretation of the written language of the Council (in their resolution of Sept. 24,) on the charge of immorality. They say: "*So positive and emphatic* an expression would *naturally be understood* to convey to the Church that *the Council wished it to be believed* that the many and suspicious facts, extending over a period of three years, adduced in support of the charges, *were explicable by the Council apart from the supposition of criminality.*" Again, they say: "The decision on the second charge, that the Council acquit Dr. Pryor, &c., would appear to express the conviction of the Council that all the evidence in support of the charge *was explicable by them on grounds consistent with honesty.*"

Before I turn your attention to the verbal statements which are referred to as neutralizing the written decision, let me beg you to pause for a moment at this point in the transaction. You behold eleven of your brethren prayerfully engaged in a solemn duty; they put their decision in writing, and attest it by their signatures; the document passes from their hands and is to remain for all time to come a record between the parties. In it they find the accused to be "*not guilty,*" they "*acquit*" him; the language to this effect, which they use, is "*positive and emphatic,*" it is "naturally to be understood" that "the Council wished the Church to believe," and "it would appear to express the conviction of the Council" that the *facts and evidence adduced against the accused were all explicable, "apart from the supposition of criminality"—"on grounds consistent with honesty."*

The meaning of the written document being thus explicit, Granville Street Church itself being the judge, the question arises:—Did these Councillors mean what they said? We must suppose that they meant what the document imports, unless they were ignorant men, who did not apprehend the force of the language they used, and wrote one thing while they intended something very different;—or corrupt men, who, with prayer on their lips, were practising a deceit on the Church, on Dr. Pryor, on the Denomination, and on the public.

Let us marshal these brethren and see whether they belong to either class:—Revds. Dr. Spurdén, George Armstrong, John Davis, I. E. Bill, A. S. Hunt, W. S. McKenzie, C. Randall and S. March, and T. R. Patillo, James E. Rand, W. Faulkner, and Abel M. Wheelock, Esqrs.,—these are not ignorant men. Among them are the most eminent ministers in the Denomination,—the President of the Baptist Seminary at Fredericton, the Editor of the Denominational Organ of New Brunswick, all accustomed to write, and versed in the use of language; to the eight ministers are added four laymen, intelligent and experienced men of business. The Council was assuredly not composed of ignorant men. Are they corrupt men who have conspired together to deceive? We must have some strong evi-