

Bridgetown, September 21st, 1867.

MY DEAR SIR,—It having been necessary for the Rev. W. S. McKenzie, pastor of Leinster Street Church, St. John, N. B., to retire from the Council before its Decision was prepared, he writes me, that having read said document, he authorizes me to affix his signature to said Decision so far as it relates to the allegations against the Rev. Dr. Pryor. You will please, therefore, to affix his name accordingly, in approval of the finding of the Council on the case so far as heard by him, and oblige,

Yours respectfully,

GEO. ARMSTRONG,

*Sec'y. of Council.*

B. H. EATON, Esq., *Clerk of Granville St. Church, Halifax.*

Tuesday, September 24th, 1867.

Church meeting. Deacon Selden in the chair. Minutes of last meeting read and approved.

Committee appointed at the last meeting reported. After some discussion report adopted. Deacon Nutting did not act on this Committee.

The following resolution was then moved by the Clerk, and seconded by Bro. Paint, and passed:—

The decision of the Council with a copy of their minutes having been submitted to, and carefully considered by this meeting.

*Resolved.*—That with respect to the recommendation which concludes the decision, the Church regard it as alike due to the Council, and to Dr. Pryor that that recommendation be promptly acted upon, but in approaching the reconsideration which the Council have advised, the Church is sorry to be compelled to say that they do not feel warranted in adopting the findings of the Council as their basis of reconsideration, for the following among other reasons:—

1.—The Council, in framing a moral decision, which, from the great notoriety both of the charges made, and of the vehement denial by the accused of his guilt, must of necessity obtain a very wide circulation, have adopted the formula of the verdict of a jury in a Court of Law, instead of the unequivocal language of a deliverance of a Church Council.

The decision on the first charge reads thus: "that in the opinion of the Council, Dr. Pryor is not guilty of immorality as charged in the Allegation, &c." So positive and emphatic an expression would naturally be understood to convey to the Church, that the Council wished it to believe 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; whereas, as publicly explained to the Church, by the President of the Council, it expresses the fact that direct evidence of criminality was wanting.

The decision on the second charge "that the Council acquit Dr. Pryor of dishonest or fraudulent intention, in his dealings as the agent of Miss Viass, &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; whereas, as publicly explained by the President of the Council to the Church, it means that dishonest and fraudulent intention was not to their minds fully proved.

The decision is not correct in regard to the case of Mrs. Morgan, inasmuch as the Church put in evidence, and the Council received certain statements made by Dr. Pryor to a Committee of the Church, and reduced to writing by them, in terms suggested by Dr. Pryor himself, (see copy of Minutes of Council, 7th Session).