

They trample under foot the decision of the Council when in favor of Dr. Pryor, and challenge respect for a decision of the same Council when supposed to bear in their own favor. Far, however, be it from me to withhold this small measure of comfort. Compare what the Council have said and what I have said on this point, and a striking coincidence will be remarked. Both extenuate;—both censure. The Council treated the Church with great tenderness, and were unwilling that their mistakes should impugn their affection to their pastor. Yet I think even the Council would admit that, judged by their acts, the thermometer of Christian affection did not stand high in Granville Street Church in this inception of the proceedings.

II.—The next charge is, that the witnesses were examined in Dr. Pryor's absence.

The defence set up against this charge is such a compound of childish quibbles, and mean evasions, as to be beneath notice. I refer you to what is said in my Letter, pages 8, 9; and in the Reply, pages 9, 10, 11. You will discover there these two facts.

*First*—that my statement is not denied, that "as soon as I heard that witnesses had been examined in Dr. Pryor's absence, I earnestly besought Mr. Selden to induce his fellow Committee-men to abandon so unjust a course. When I saw him again he told me that he had mentioned my objection, but the Committee declined altering the practice they had adopted."—Letter, page 8.

*Secondly*—It will be seen (Reply, page 10) that it was arranged to notify Dr. Pryor of the examination of one witness,—I believe the last who was examined at that time,—"but the witness being absent at the time appointed, her evidence was subsequently taken in Dr. Pryor's absence."

These two facts are sufficient.

There would seem to have been a deep purpose in the conduct of the Committee in this matter. By examining Dr. Pryor on questions suggested by the previous statements of the witnesses, of which he had been kept in ignorance, the opportunity was afforded of entangling him. I was not present, and cannot speak from my own knowledge; but I have learnt enough of what passed on Dr. Pryor's examination, to believe that this advantage was exercised, unrestrained by decent respect or ordinary decorum; and as I understand that Dr. Pryor did not decline to answer any question, however revolting, the Committee and the Church had all the benefit that could be extracted from a course so unusual, and so opposed to the cherished notions of free men. That they made little out of it, is but evidence of Dr. Pryor's innocence.

This second charge is, in fact, not denied. You are to judge whether the attempts that have been made to evade it, are not at once disingenuous and childish.

III.—The Church was charged with a failure of duty of the most serious nature, in not calling a Council at an early stage of the transaction, aggravated by the fact that at a meeting of all the deacons