

YOUR OMISSIONS AND EVASIONS.

either you nor your sitting coadjutor in misrepresentation and meanness, the "Vindicator," attempts any reply to the exposure of the illegality, injustice, and sinfulness of the acts of Conference in 1849 and since. The omissions in your Nos. 881 and 882, which I noted in your last issue. And yet the omitted are both numerous and momentous. To most of my charges against you for artifice, unfairness, and moral obliquity, you attempt no defence ever.

You neither attempt to maintain your maimed and galled theology, nor endeavour to refute my distinctions and arguments.

Instead of grappling with the great facts and arguments, you seize a few points for editorial expatriation instead of fairly and logically considering those, you misrepresent, insinuate, and evade; and, by false and warrantable innuendoes and charges respecting my age and temper, you attempt to disparage me with your pen. Your unworthy purpose will utterly fail, and the use of my employment will serve only to disgrace yourself for the estimation of every intelligent and upright mind.

(To the Editor of the "Vindicator.")

I have a few words for you, in addition to those already bestowed on you, as an exposure of the dishonourable and insinuating articles, misrepresentations, and falsehoods in the 25th No. of your calumnious and disgraceful publication. I shall not waste time and space by repeating my answer to what you merely echo, though I may briefly note it. The use of this reply is to put the public on their guard of you.

I say that "once a-year, at least, I formally avowed allegiance to Wesleyan discipline." I have shown that false.

I say that my "case" has been "formally investigated and judged by the constitutional authorities of the Conference." This, too, is utterly false. It was the case of the Methodist Missionary Secretaries that was investigated and decided. There has never been a case of mine before any civil or ecclesiastical.

I speak of my "claims now put forth for public sympathy and support." This also is false. I am not claiming any public support, but merely delivering an independent testimony to the truth. Both privately and publicly have declared that I neither ask nor seek for any.

I say you speak of my "diligence and alacrity in the work of Reform, and something more beside," you betray such innuendo, meanness and cowardice. I dare declare your meaning.

I say I am not likely "to inflict any serious damage on the sacred Missionary cause." You know I am not to inflict any such damage; my whole character testifies the absence of any wish to do so; and nothing more ungenerous and ignoble than to deal in such insinuation.

I say you call an oath is simply a prayer; for my use of words (to which you refer) in a letter, is not to be considered or identified with the use and import of them in a court of justice. Stronger forms of expression are found in the apostolical epistles, which even you would not call swearing.

I say I have come home in great wrath, and that I did swear. "Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbour."

I say the Minor District Meeting in Jamaica was "interfered with by the authorities at home." It was interfered with by only four Missionary clerks, who acted with knowledge or authority of the Missionary Committee concealed the whole business and correspondence of the committee, till the impeaching memorial brought to light. The interference of the Secretaries was a

kind of clandestine and unrighteous usurpation, as well as gross misrepresentation and perversion; and yet this has been eulogised by the Conference as "wise, and forbearing!!!"

I say "Mr. Manly protested to the Conference." You say that nine Jamaica Missionaries impeached the Secretaries by a memorial to the Conference.

I say that I had "a difference with an inferior tribunal" and carried my cause "to the supreme tribunal." sheer falsehood. I had no difference with any inferior tribunal, for four Missionary clerks are not a tribunal; and was not "my cause" that was carried to the supreme tribunal, but the cause of truth and righteousness,—the cause of Wesleyan polity and law, which these clerks had grossly and audaciously violated.

I say that my cause is precisely such as that

memorial was not discussed at full length there; and you ought not to be guilty of such a fabrication. You know that, instead of this, I declared, in my protest, that the proper course was to read the memorial, and refer it, if necessary, to a committee; and you know that what I protest against is not only the non-perusal, but the irrelevant and deceptive speeches of Messrs. Scott and Duncan, of which you take no notice. I also protest against your brother's conduct, in the chair, in bringing the memorial before the Conference at the only time when Dr. Beaumont happened to be late in his attendance, and in allowing a conversation depreciatory of Dr. Beaumont to take place in his absence.

With the applications of Messrs. Rowden and Mearns, for leave to return to England, I have nothing to do; and what I said, in my own application, was perfectly explicit.

Very artfully and unfairly you speak of New Brunswick and Canada as almost the same, though they are hundreds of miles asunder, and the former is altogether a strange land to me; and of the "exile" as consisting in the place to which I was appointed, instead of in the appointed removal, as a punishment, from the land of my residence and labours. The material elements of the attempted degradation you artfully conceal; and you sophistically intimate a parallel between Dr. Clarke's voluntary avoidance of superintendence and the authoritative termination of my superintendence, without my knowledge or consent, and my decreed subordination to one nine years younger, in an unsuitable climate, to which the Conference had no right to appoint me.

You write as if my opposition to the conduct of the Missionary Secretaries had arisen from pecuniary loss, when you know, or ought to know, that what I protested against was not pecuniary loss, but the order for malappropriation of missionary money, and other acts of usurpation and injustice. I have never been mulcted in any sum, great or small; and though Mr. Edmondson did corrupt the District Meeting records, in accordance with the instructions of the secretaries and his own wishes, and though the Conference has sanctioned this corruption, yet, up to the time of my departure from Jamaica, no attempt was made to execute the order of the secretaries for the malappropriation of money.

What eight other missionaries and myself have resisted and prosecuted, you call "trifles." How blind and insensate must be the man, professing and preaching Christianity, and charged with important duties in a theological training school, who can call clandestine, untruthful, despotic, unjust, and hypocritical proceedings trifles, and can attempt to merge great principles in a question of mere pecuniary loss! And how lamentable it is to see such a man conducting a bitter and calumnious periodical, calling great questions trifles, and yet talking about "moral and spiritual merits," and about others possessing "little of the spirit which cometh from above!" And why beholdest thou the mote that is in thy brother's eye, but considerest not the beam that is in thine own eye?

The last of your falsehoods which I shall now expose, is your assertion that I omit to state that the secretaries did not vote. In my reply to the decision on the memorial, are the following words:—"This shows clearly that the secretaries did everything, as members of the committee, except voting for the acquittal and eulogium of themselves."

"The secretaries * * * magnanimously abstained from a formal vote." And yet you, the Rev. Samuel Jackson, Wesleyan minister, and house-governor in the Theological Institution, declare to the world, as a piece of constitutional Methodism, that Mr. Manly "omits to state that they (the secretaries) did not vote," although I had stated it twice!!!

I leave yourself, your character, your cause, and your composition, to the impartial estimate of the churches and of the public at large. Anything you can say, after your 25th number, is beneath contempt.

I am, gentlemen of the *Watchman* and the "Vindicator," yours, truly,

JOHN G. MANLY.

2, Alfred Cottages, North-end, Fulham, Dec. 8, 1851.

P.S. The *Watchman* tauntingly attempts to disparage me on account of my honourable fidelity in drawing away none of the Jamaica Societies from the Connexion. The opposite of what the *Watchman* thus holds up as a reproach, the "Vindicator," in relation to Mr. Allison, describes as a crime:—"We presume that our readers will agree with ourselves that such conduct as this, on the part of a missionary, would be much more accurately described as a disruption of the bonds of righteousness—a rejection of the obligations imposed, we will not say by religion merely, but by a sense of common honesty." Which of these two semi-official organs is right in this opposition? The one conserves and guards Methodism, the other vindicates Methodism. Of course, then, they must be both right, on the principle—"You'll be condemned if you do, and you'll be condemned if you don't."