

and wicked prejudice, 'no not for an hour,' be the consequences what they may." You said under date of Dec. 1, in reply to my account of what I had done and meant to do, "Your course since your arrival in Victoria, seems to us wise and judicious. * * It is sad to think that such a wicked feeling should exist in a British colony. *You do right to set your face against it.*"

Yet when I refuse to "give place" to a man who becomes the impersonation and embodiment of this "wicked feeling," its high-priest and minister; when I "set my face against it," in the person of him whom you sent to be my associate and helper; your tone suddenly changes; my course is no longer "wise and judicious;" I ought to have allowed this wicked feeling to indulge itself "without blame or opposition!"

Coming now to the 4th Resolution, it is manifest that there is no ground whatever for the condemnation of myself and my circular, in which the whole series culminates. Permit me to ask *why* I ought to have allowed Mr. Macfie to pursue his course "without blame or opposition?" Was there nothing in it in your view, worthy of "blame or opposition?" If so could you possibly express a more favourable opinion of Mr. Macfie's procedure? If his course merited "blame and opposition," then for you not to forbid it, is a direct contradiction of the command, "Thou shalt in any wise rebuke thy brother."

You appear to think that Mr. Macfie, deeming his course "conscientiously right," was necessarily raised above all criticism and rebuke. But deeming a thing "conscientiously right" does not make it so. Consciences may be warped. They may be misled. Such things have happened to good men before. It is possible to be *conscientiously wrong*, as well as *conscientiously right*.

Had Peter and Paul been at work in Antioch under your auspices, it would have been decided that Peter ought to have been allowed to pursue the course he deemed "conscientiously right without blame or opposition," when he and the Jews dissembled, and carried Barnabas away with them. Of course you believe in the inspiration of the 2nd ch. of Galatians, Paul's "circular" about the Antioch affair. You do not wish the distribution of that to be stopped as far as possible out of regard to Peter's reputation. We Congregationalists talk much of New Testament example and apostolic precedent. What have I done but imperfectly copy these? Mr. Macfie and I were in Victoria to promote the cause of Christ, precisely as Peter and Paul were in Antioch. I treated him in all respects as a brother beloved until his course became unrighteous and unchristian. Then "I withstood him to the face because he was to be blamed,"—in that he "walked not uprightly according to the truth of the gospel." And in the issue of my "Circular," I have only carried a just cause to a legitimate tribunal, the consciences of good men.

You not only find fault with the *fact* of my making a protest against Mr. Macfie but with the *manner* in which I did it. You say, I ought not to have brought slavery into the question. Why not? Is not what you joined with me on Dec. 1, in styling a "wicked feeling," the offspring of slavery? Is it wrong to call Jeroboam the son of Nebat, or to say of lying that Satan is the father of it? You complain that my language is too strong. This only shews that your convictions are too weak, though you say, what your action renders very difficult of belief, that you are "thorough-going anti-slavery men." Never before was it my lot to find any but milk-and-water anti-slavery men, disposed to tolerate, much less approve and patronize, that hateful concomitant of slavery, "the negro corner." You cannot separate slavery and its progeny. They bear a strong family likeness, and cling together with inseparable affinity. Nor is the offspring a whit better than the parent, and that John Wesley rightly styled, "the sum of all villainies." Permit me to remind you of the relapsed condition of Mansoul, when *Diabolians disguised in soft names*, became the cherished associates of its citizens.

Worse than all your criticisms on the "Circular," is your intimation that you wish its distribution arrested. It is in circulation by hundreds, I scarce know where, and I can no more stop it than I can stay the rolling stream or flowing tide. You must be well aware that it can only be counteracted by something like a retraction on my part. And do you suppose I have a conscience so supple that your bidding can induce me to pen a counter document? Martyrdom would not