

Passing over the charity of this extract, but inviting attention to its policy and veracity, I remark—

1. My Letter is represented as containing “unfounded allegations against the character of Mr. McFadden.” The private, the moral the pious or personal character of the gentleman is not once noticed, alluded to, or in any way broached in the ‘eight-paged tract’ from the first line to the last; and therefore it would have been equally just and truthful had the writer of the above said that my Letter contained unfounded allegations against the character of every teacher. Wesleyan or anti-Wesleyan, who instructs sinners to bow down to an unscriptural altar. All that a public man publicly teaches or does, is fairly subject to public review; and if criticism be candid and impartial, it will not be the minister’s personal character but his theological words and acts which will pass under critical consideration. Hence my Letter regards the gentleman in question in no other light than in his theological position as a preacher and practical advocate of the new machinery called an altar; and I have learned that some of said gentleman’s friends at Picton affirm that there is not one uncorrected personal expression in all my communication to him. And it is to be feared that those who speak of my tract assailing character, understand not what they say nor whereof they affirm. The man who cannot discriminate between a minister’s private, personal, or moral character and his religious position as an advocate of a system, is not likely to be a very bright scholar in any department, and my consent is given forthwith that he shall be turned over to an able master than myself for further instruction.

2. My laconic reviewer next speaks of my “aspersions upon the means used for the conversion of the ungodly.” Without stopping to speak particularly of “aspersions upon means,” as though means could be aspersed, and without troubling the reader to reflect upon the unfitness of the term aspersion in this connexion even if employed correctly, I frankly admit that my Letter contained strong remonstrances in the name of truth against the use of means and operations at popular protracted meetings to convert men to the Lord. If the gospel or the Lord of the gospel allowed me, I would be the first man to offer an apology for those pointed objections to the employment of such means. But my pen must confirm and not retract what has been called “aspersions.” Such means may be used for the conversion of men to a late system—a theological scheme devised since christianity was established; but the Lord’s own means must be employed for the conversion of the ungodly to the religion of heaven.

3. Concerning “Mr. D. Oliphant, the Solon of the Greenites.”