

Throughout the Church records of Granville Street Church will be seen the same marks of the tortuous mind,—the same absence of simplicity of thought and feeling,—the same resort to puerile distinctions, overstrained argument and captious objections, that abound throughout the Reply; and nothing, anywhere, of the honesty, frankness, candor, and plain common sense, that should distinguish the utterance of a Church of Christ.

If it has been mortifying to be obliged to give my time and thought to such a production as the Reply, it has been distressing to be obliged to speak, as I have done, of a Church with which I have been connected since its formation, some forty years ago; in whose formation I bore no inconsiderable part, and in whose fellowship I had expected to pass the short remnant of my days.

I have the satisfaction to know that in all my connection with the Church I have never aimed at pre-eminence, or failed in marked deference to others; and throughout the unhappy transactions to which your attention has been called, it is a source of gratification that I acted with a strict regard to my duty as a member. My error was, in communicating too little with Dr. Pryor in the early stages, and in not detecting the necessity of using any influence I might possess, to counteract the banding of members into an unreasoning body, following their leaders; yet, I take consolation in the assurance, that had the counsel I gave, been regarded, much of the evil we deplore would have been averted.

It is for you to pronounce on the charges I have brought against Granville Street Church, and to determine the questions that arise out of those charges.

It is intimated, indeed, that it becomes not a single member to pronounce upon the conduct of the Church. What! Is the eye to be blind to acts of injustice and oppression; the ear deaf to falsehoods perpetrated before it; and seeing and hearing, is there to be no corresponding action? Are others to be serfs, that a few in Granville Street Church may play the despot? These pretensions suit neither Baptist principles nor Baptist feeling.

But I need not dwell upon these. Granville Street Church admits that "every member of the Baptist Churches comprising the Central Association, has pledged himself to refer the important matter of unchurching a Church, as far as the expression of the public opinion of the Church goes, to the Association," (Reply, page 33) and that is the question I refer to you. Had, indeed the Dartmouth Church been awed by the significant hint in the Reply, page 33, or swayed by its sophistry, I should have been shut out from this opportunity of addressing you, by the act of exclusion, which act, long deferred came not a great while before holding the Association.

I am not insensible to the influence which Granville Street Church will bring to bear on this enquiry, and the embarrassment which these influences may throw around the steps of many members. For the sake of the Denomination, and the cause of truth, I trust that the uprightness and intelligence of the Association will be equal to the