

THE "WATCHMAN" AND "VINDICATOR"

From THE WESLEYAN TIMES of

(To the Editor of the *Watchman*.)
SIR,—For such reasons as I assigned last week, I must expose the evils and offences of your last issue.

For reason and argument, you substitute mis-statement, perversion, and abuse. Unable to answer me, you endeavour to asperse me; and, unable to asperse my acts, you attempt to traduce my spirit and motives. Such base and miserable shifts are easily exposed and apprehended, and will recoil upon their author in damage and disgrace. My published letters, which are, in fact, and in the estimation of others, methodical, you call "amorphous," disclosures and statements in letters, you call "pleadings;" what was, in reality, the case of the Missionary Secretaries, the case of their impeachment and trial, you speak of as my case; an unrighteous decision of the Committee and the Conference, you call "dismissal and rebuke;" you speak of backing and dubbing, as if you were familiar with the ring or the turf; when you can no longer deny my calmness in Exeter-hall, though you slanderously denied it at first, you quibble about words; the avowal that I prepared the memorial, you call a vaunt; and you talk of doing "job-work," and "blowing hot and cold on porridge," like a perfect master of slang. The man who does the "job-work" of the *Watchman*, under the strict revision and scrutiny of the Mission-house, should remember the folly of throwing stones out of a glass-house. Pity that you write with such random ignorance and misuse of words.

I. YOUR OBTUSENESS.

You cannot see the difference between "leaving" and "sentencing" an accuser to pay the costs, as if either word indicated, with equal propriety, a judicial decree; or the difference between protesting against the secretaries, and trying them; or the difference between influencing *men* to sign a memorial, and afterwards promoting the memorial; and you cannot distinguish the acts and proceedings of a committee from its report and resolutions. Your dulness is either very pitiable or very blameable. If the first, your proper remedy is to return to school, and to study *lexicography*. Allow me to ask, if a committee cannot adopt a resolution which is not embodied in their report and resolutions for another tribunal? and if they cannot mutilate, at a secret and partial meeting, what was agreed upon at a previous and full meeting? Does not a Report mutilate the proceedings of a Judicial Committee when it wholly omits one of the committee's most important resolutions? And does it not comport with the Connexional trickery and injustice which I have exposed, for a Judicial Committee to recommend a minister's banishment, in order that that recommendation may operate *orally* on the Stationing Committee, while yet, from policy, the recommendation is excluded from the Committee's written Report?

As to my "alliterative expression," first used in a letter, and then quoted on the platform, it was applied to none, but intended for all whom it suits. Can you discern this difference? I am neither so silly as to be "sadly nettled" by anything you can say, nor so undignified as to make "excuses" to you.

You cannot or you will not see the difference between the *finality* of the Minor Meeting's decision respecting the charge, and the *perfect practicability* of founding a new charge on the unproved defence, as *libellous* or *slandrous*, and preferring this charge in the Annual District Meeting, under the head of character. The Annual District Meeting could not and would not reverse the Minor Meeting's decree, but it could take cognisance of a new accusation. Instead of such an accusation, the secretaries themselves have shown that the plaintiff, Mr. Edmondson, had no objection whatever to the defendant, Mr. Bleby, for his defence or for anything else. I do not say that the defence of Mr. Bleby contained "irrelevant" matter; but I say it was unproved matter, which needed no reply in the Minor Meeting, and in relation to the indictment of that meeting; and I say it was no more irrelevant than Mr. Edmondson's evidence and statements; and, if it be necessary, I can adduce particulars and make queer disclosures. In the Minor Meeting there was no "singular postponement of defence;" but there was a just and prudent disallowance of litigation on an unproved and, therefore, immaterial defence.

You deny that "such a committee [as that on the memorial] could take any action apart from or beyond its official Report." You are, therefore, so obtuse that you cannot see the difference between taking action by a resolution not reported in writing to the Conference, but reported orally or not at all to the Stationing Committee, and taking action by a resolution that was reported in writing to the Conference. Your blindness is really marvellous!

You cannot see the difference between "prolonged innes-

tion of disparaging me, when, in fact, what was said, and what perfectly correct subsequent conduct. The articles I write now, and I can publish them if necessary, the "Vindicator" will find me armed a controversy.

3. You confound my ecclesiastical vindictive views, and, on this confusion, your insinuations. It is a pure fabrication that I held my present estimate of you was defending it in newspapers. My defence was not of what I now condemn, but of what I now praise; and it was not contemporary knowledge of Methodism and of Divine discipline.

4. It is also a pure fabrication, and in my published reasons for resigning, to which I have been asked, and have a my attachment to Wesleyan doctrine have never been asked, and I have in any period of my life, respecting *English* discipline. Such asking and answering, in relation to *Canadian* Methodist discipline, and my ordination. The *District Meeting* had "duly observed and enforced our discipline," and I have never been asked, and have never respected any discipline, since 1838, except that are elicited in each Annual Meeting, respecting the *official administration* the past year.

IV. YOUR FURTHER FALSEHOODS.

1. That I am hasty, passionate, and &c. Greater misstatements you could not always write deliberately and calmly, and earnestly.

2. That I am, "at this moment, in a frame of mind, because no further official notice of me." It is impossible for human or human hand to indite a more untruthful statement, for which you have not even the shadow of a fact. It is the falsehood of absurdity to say that because no further official notice is taken from whom I have freely and entirely written delinquencies I at once detest and disclaim as the Missionary Secretaries I have not stoop in wrangling, though I have good cause that they are anxiously occupied behind scenes; and to talk of my wish to reform the courts of Wesleyanism, I have never, ever, by my renunciation of a corrupt and most palpable misstatement of which I was exasperated at neglect, when the fact is stated, utterly and for ever, either to neglect of the Clique and its coadjutors.

3. Equally absurd and false is your statement, that I am seeking to prolong the attention of some attention from you; while I am merely defending myself against your calumnies, obtuseness, misrepresentations, falsehood, and perverseness. So, when a man with his shield, and draws his sword, to assault a nocturnal foe, ycleped a *Warrant* to attract some attention from that foe, if you can, and confess that the force of falsehood can no further go.

4. But the crowning falsehood is your statement, that I am seeking to prolong the attention of some attention from you; while I am merely defending myself against your calumnies, obtuseness, misrepresentations, falsehood, and perverseness. So, when a man with his shield, and draws his sword, to assault a nocturnal foe, ycleped a *Warrant* to attract some attention from that foe, if you can, and confess that the force of falsehood can no further go.

These four falsehoods and those previous ones, "Therefore, putting away from me the truth with his neighbour," said Dr. Bunting, "is conservative of *M* conserved!"

V. YOUR OMISSIONS AND EVASIONS.

1. Neither you nor your fitting coadjutor and meanness, the "Vindicator," to my exposure of the illegality, injustice, and various acts of Conference in 1849 and since.

2. The omissions in your Nos. 881 and 882 last week, are not supplied in your last points omitted are both numerous and

3. To most of my charges against you, namely, falsehood, and moral obliquity, you have not answered.

4. You neither attempt to maintain the nibbling theology, nor endeavour to reform and arguments.

Instead of grappling with the great points of my letters, you seize a few points of contention; instead of fairly and logically con-