

little value

It would
they might
e in which
the neces-
be equally
recognize
public wor-
exercising
therefore, I
of twenty
y and the
in others,
better ac-
e use the
ous days ;
is lawful,

a witness
rather had
to whom?
too bitter
gift "to

It was
and con-
ended to
. If he
ny other
et a few
removal to
ntrary to
pnnisha-
agle is
represent
e in the
ing lum
it, as a
and In-
ajesty's
such a
e public
at deal.
eterate
aim for
re than
forever
y years
d upon

that ground a Church was afterwards completed. Can he feel that he acts the character of an honest man when he seeks by a private suit to put the value of that public building into his private purse? Shame! shame! your hear the Plaintiff and his Ryonites exclaim—shame, to remove the Church, though only a few yards, for the better accommodation of the public and security of the property, receiving thereby no other rewards than scandal from the impious, and vexation from the litigious. But while they thus vociferate, shame, shame, and point to the mote in the defendants' eye, can they be wholly insensible to the beam which distorts the visage of the Plaintiff? Can they be blind to the greater enormity, not of preserving it where it is, not of removing it back for the public use, but the shameless speculation of prostituting a civil suit, as the means of grasping from the public for his own filthy lucre his own free gift, by realizing the value in the shape of damages, in order to pamper the latter years of his life with sacred plunder? I would rather, were it necessary, stand here as the apologist for men who openly took and converted to their own use such a public building, than stammer out a defence for a more wary plunderer, who, aiming at the same spoliation, artfully endeavors by a verdict to legalize his sacrilege. It has been removed—and out of whose grasp? out of the grasp of a man who would, with as little compunction as he now betrays, have converted it into a stable, or a barn or a house of merchandize—out of the grasp of a man who, disappointed of his prey, seeks in his mortification to realize in money the value of that "free gift" which the vigilance and manliness of my clients rescued from his avaricious gripe, and preserved for those Christian uses to which it has been consecrated for upwards of twenty years.

Such at best are the merits of the case as made out in evidence for the father by the son. But it is still more lamentable to notice, that only a small portion of this young man's testimony is true. It is matter of public notoriety, and of written record, that this "free gift" was made, and this building erected, for the sole and exclusive use of the Methodist Episcopal Church. Here lie before me, fortunately preserved, the original subscription papers* circulated in the years 1810 and 1811. These documents may be said to speak for themselves; their evidence cannot be perverted either from want of memory or want of truth. No doubt, with a charity honorable to yourselves, you hope (and with that hope every spectator sympathizes) to find a corroboration of this young man's evidence; you hope to find that the Church was built "for all preachers and congregations that might chuse to assemble there." You will, on the contrary, find that it was built expressly for the very uses to which it has been applied notoriously for upwards of twenty years, viz: for the exclusive use of the Methodist Episcopal Church. Had

* These papers were afterwards shown to the jury; and they expressly stated the house to be for the use of the Methodist Episcopal Church. The Deed stated for the Methodist Episcopal Church and no other.