

...matter, but I say it was an *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 investigation," which alone I avowed, and "*long-matured change of view*," which I did not avow, but which you falsely ascribe to me.

### II. YOUR INCONSISTENCY.

1. On the one hand, you declare that "the moment it becomes a personal quarrel between the reverend gentleman and ourselves, it is our fixed determination to dismiss him to hector at his full leisure, sole combatant in the field," thus disclaiming all personalities; on the other hand, and at the very same time, you interlard and overload your editorial remarks with the following scurrilous and utterly untruthful personalities: "He flies at our face with a degree of passion that blinds and exposes him." So, also, you accuse me of "haste and temper," of speaking "in the unthinkingness of my anger," of being "too hasty to be a consistent advocate of my own cause," of being "agitated," "angry and impetuous." You abound in personalities, and compel me to "answer a fool according to his folly, lest he be wise in his own conceit," and yet you very absurdly talk of personalities as a reason for retiring from a controversy which you yourself commenced. Already you feel your feebleness and defeat, and hang out signs of retreat, and show false colours. You doubtless think "discretion the better part of valour;" and, like Hudibras, you magniloquently talk of "dismissing" an opponent whom you have never admitted into your columns, except to garble and misrepresent him.

2. On the one hand, you say, "We are not wont to say, in his own idiom, that a gentleman talks unmitigated falsehood;" on the other hand, you quote and endorse against me the expression, "a vile calumny," and denominate one of my charges "a foul calumny." There is this great difference between us: you write thus of a Christian minister by name; I write thus of an anonymous editor, whom I do not know to be a gentleman, or anything else respectable. You write falsely; I write truly and justly.

### III. YOUR MISREPRESENTATIONS.

1. You say, I now "charge as a mutilation of the Report that it does not contain what it did not authorise." I say nothing so silly; but I say, on the authority of an impeachable member of the committee, that the Report and Resolutions are a mutilated account of the decisions of the committee; and that an appointment, which Connexionally originated with a Judicial Committee as a punishment, was hypocritically communicated to me, as a kindness from the Conference. In what way you will "take Dr. Beaumont's testimony" is of no consequence whatever, either to myself or to the public at large.

It may be necessary to explain, once for all, that Dr. Beaumont was not the agent, attorney, or proxy of the memorialists, in any forensic sense, or in the sense of compact, or in the sense of formal appointment or acceptance, but solely in the sense of receiving their papers and promoting their cause, in the spirit of brotherly kindness and Christian justice. Such a relation as this disqualified him in no degree whatever for voting. That this was his only relation he himself avowed in the committee, in reply to Mr. Mason; and though Mr. Samuel Jackson heard this avowal, he yet insinuatingly founds upon the disavowed sense an unwarrantable parallel between Dr. Beaumont and the Missionary Secretaries. Where are truth and fairness?

2. I complained of the moral obliquity and perverseness of yourself and the "Vindicator," in endeavouring to convert my kindness and fidelity into a disparagement. Of your own conduct you attempt no defence; but for your brother of the "Vindicator" you set up a disgraceful defence. Upwards of four years ago, and before the recent developments of modern Methodism, I vindicated, not "the system" of Methodism, much less the present system, as the "Vindicator" falsely declares,—but the Methodist Missionaries, from the aspersions of a newspaper. I did it deliberately, but earnestly; and because that newspaper accused me of vehemence, or something of the kind, the "Vindicator" refers to the matter with the obvious inten-

### V. YOUR OMISSIONS AND EVASIONS.

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

2. The omissions in your Nos. 881 and 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 no answer whatever.

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

Instead of grappling with the greater issues of my letters, you seize a few points for petty cavil; instead of fairly and logically confuting me, you garble, misrepresent, insinuate, and use unwarrantable innuendoes and charges of motives and temper, you attempt to disguise the truth from your readers. Your unworthy purpose will be served if you employ will serve only to cover in the estimation of every intelligent

(To the Editor of the "Vindicator")

SIR,—I have a few words for you, in reply, bestowing on you, as an exposure and Jesuitical artifices, misrepresentation of the 25th No. of your calumnious and untruthful. I shall not waste time and space in swearing to what you merely echo, though the chief use of this reply is to put the point against you.

You say that "once a-year, at least, my attachment to Wesleyan discipline," this is false.

You say that my "case" has been "adjudged" and adjudged by the constitutional authority. This, too, is utterly false. It is impeached Missionary Secretaries that were adjudged. There has never been a case of judicial, civil or ecclesiastical.

You speak of my "claims now put forth as a pathy and support." This also is false. I am seeking any public support, but merely dependent testimony to the truth. Both of which I have declared that I neither ask nor desire.

When you speak of my "diligence in cause of Reform, and something more," I say, by such innuendo, meanness and you to declare your meaning.

You say I am not likely "to inflict upon the sacred Missionary cause." You are seeking to inflict any such damage; I guarantee the absence of any wish to do so, but more ungenerous and ignoble than base insinuation.

What you call an oath is simply a promise (the words (to which you refer) in a letter founded or identified with the use of an oath in a court of justice. Stronger forms of oath to be found in the apostolical epistles, will scarcely call swearing.

You say I have come home in great haste and swear, "Thou shalt not bear witness against thy neighbour."

You say the Minor District Meeting interfered with by the authorities at home, and interfered with by only four Missionary clerks, out of the knowledge or authority of the committee, and concealed the whole business from the committee, till the impeaching them to light. The interference of the process of clandestine and unrighteous as of gross misrepresentation and perversion of process has been eulogised by the Committee, and forbearing!!

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

You say that I had "a difference with the Conference," and carried my cause "to the Conference." This is sheer falsehood. I had no difference with the Conference, but a superior tribunal, for four Missionary clerks and it was not "my cause" that was carried to the Conference, but the cause of truth and of the cause of Wesleyan polity and law, which was most grossly and audaciously violated.

You say that my cause is precisely