

of this fact, they have dared to deceive the public with the pretence of consultation, proposal, concurrence.

My son was present, and has given me the statement which follows :

TO THE HON. J. W. JOHNSTON—

On the Friday evening at which the matters connected with Dr. Pryor were first brought to the notice of the Church, after my proposition that Dr. Pryor should continue to preach as usual, and be treated as innocent until proved guilty, —and your proposition that several of the deacons should talk the subject over with him next morning, and, if possible, come to some unison of sentiment,—had both been rejected, it was decided that he should not preach on the approaching Sunday. This decision was absolute and unqualified, and Mr. Selden was requested to communicate with Dr. Pryor, and procure another minister.

Next day I was present at Mr. Selden's office, when Dr. Pryor came in. I remained until he went out. Mr. Ackhurst was there, I think, all the time; and Mr. Rand the greater part of, if not all the time.

Without going into details, it may be enough to say, that Dr. Pryor was earnest in the expression of his desire to be permitted to preach, and strongly represented the bad effect his expulsion would have.

After a good deal of argument, in which, as well as I recollect, Mr. Selden was the principal speaker in opposition to Dr. Pryor's wishes, Dr. Pryor appeared overcome by his want of success, and, bursting into tears, hurried out of the office, complaining that he was deserted by his Church.

There was nothing like concurrence having been either asked from him or given by him. It was earnest remonstrances on the one side, and determined adherence to the previous decision on the other.

The ill consequences anticipated by Dr. Pryor did certainly result. It spread abroad that the Church believed him guilty, and had turned him out of the pulpit, and the natural effect followed.

I am, yours, &c.,

J. W. JOHNSTON, JR.

Yet more than this. Dr. Pryor's son-in-law, Prof. DeMill, on the same Saturday sought out Mr. Selden and Dr. Parker, and remonstrated with them severally on Dr. Pryor's exclusion from preaching. The following is Prof. DeMill's statement:—

*My Dear Sir,*—In answer to your request, I beg leave to make the following statements:

I. On Saturday morning I called at Dr. Pryor's house, and was shown the letter which the Church had sent him, suspending him from the pastorate.

I at once went to Mr. Selden's office, and denounced the action of the Church as hasty and injurious. Mr. Selden defended the action of the Church on various grounds.

I then called on Dr. Parker between 2 and 3 p.m., and reiterated to him my denunciation of this act of the Church. He defended it with earnestness.

In these interviews it was taken for granted that the letter of the Church was an act of suspension. Neither Mr. Selden nor Dr. Parker pretended to deny the finality of such suspension. Had this not been the case, our interviews, and the language on both sides, would have had no meaning.

II. At these interviews I asserted that this act of suspension would be regarded in the community as a virtual condemnation of Dr. Pryor. My opinion was confirmed by the event. From various quarters I learned that the public believed the action of the Church a sure proof of guilt. In the language of an influential gentleman of this city,—"By this act the Church gave their endorsement to the public scandal."

Very respectfully yours,

JAMES DEMILL.

Knowing, as I do, from having been present at the Friday evening meeting, that the determination that Dr. Pryor should not preach was