

"AND "VINDICATOR" EXPOSED.

THE WESLEYAN TIMES of December 8, 1851.

disparaging me, when, in fact, I did nothing but was right, and what perfectly comports with all my present conduct. The articles I wrote are before me and I can publish them if necessary. Both you and "Vindicator" will find me armed at all points in this reply.

You confound my ecclesiastical views with my Methodist views, and, on this confusion, you build slanderous assertions. It is a pure fabrication even to intimated that I held my present estimate of Methodism while I was writing in newspapers. My defence in newspapers of what I now condemn, but of aspersed mission-ism and it was not contemporaneous with my present regard of Methodism and of Divine teaching.

It is also a pure fabrication, and in direct opposition to published reasons for resigning, to say that very recently I have been asked, and have answered, respecting my attachment to Wesleyan doctrine and discipline. I have never been so asked, and I have never so answered, at any time of my life, respecting English Wesleyan discipline. Such asking and answering, in my case, related only to the American Methodist discipline, and never occurred after my resignation. The District Meeting has been asked if I had duly observed and enforced our discipline," but I have not myself been so asked, and have never so answered, respecting any discipline, since 1838, excepting the answers were elicited in each Annual Missionary District Meeting respecting the official administration of Methodism in that year.

YOUR FURTHER FALSEHOODS.

That I am a hasty, passionate, angry, and agitated, and Greater misstatements you could not publish. I write deliberately and calmly, though, also, plainly and earnestly.

That I am, "at this moment, in the most uneasy state of mind, because no further official notice is taken of me." It is impossible for human lips to utter an word which you have not even the shadow of a pretext. The falsehood of absurdity to say that I am most uneasy because no further official notice is taken of me by whom I have freely and entirely withdrawn, and whose agencies I at once detest and disavow. With such men as the Missionary Secretaries I have no wish whatever to do with a wrangling, though I have good reason to believe they are anxiously occupied behind your newspaper, and to talk of my wish to re-open a case which, in the interests of Wesleyanism, I have voluntarily closed for my renunciation of a corrupt Connexion, is the palpable misstatement of which man can be guilty.

That I am equally absurd and false in your statement that I am neglected at neglect, when the fact is, that I have repeatedly and for ever, either the attention or the respect of the Clique and its coadjutors.

That the crowning falsehood is your unblushing statement that I am seeking to prolong temporary notoriety by seeking some attention from you; when you know that I am solely defending myself against your artifice, unfairness, misrepresentations, falsehoods, moral obliquity and perverseness. So, when a traveller covers himself with his shield, and draws his sword against the assailant of a nocturnal foe, yelped a *Watchman*, his object is to attract some attention from that foe. Blush for shame, then, and confess that the force of folly and the front of falsehood can no further go.

That the four falsehoods and those previously exposed, make up a "Therefore, putting away lying, speak ye every man the truth with his neighbour." ("The *Watchman*," No. 100, p. 100). Bunting, "is conservative of Methodism." What a lie!

YOUR OMISSIONS AND EVASIONS.

Neither you nor your fitting 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 my article, are not supplied in your last issue. And yet the omissions are both numerous and momentous.

The most of my charges against you for artifice, unfairness, obliquity, and moral obliquity, you attempt no defence of.

You neither attempt to maintain your maimed and mutilated 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 these, you

of a man who denounces the institutions of his country, and disparages and threatens the judges, because he has lost his cause on appeal. You know that is altogether false; because you know that it was not my cause that was lost; and that my course arises, not from the failure of the impeachment, but from the developed despotism and corruption of the Conference, and from the discovered un-Scripturalness of the Wesleyan polity. Such logic as you attribute to me is not mine at all, but an issue of your own brain.

You say that my case "depends on one position—the finality of Minor District Meetings." If you do not know this to be altogether false, you are lamentably dull; because it has been clearly and fully shown, in the papers of the memorialists, which came before yourself and others in committee, that, whether the decision of the Minor Meeting was reversible or not, the interference of the secretaries was altogether unwarrantable and illegal.

The doctrine of the finality, not of Minor Meetings in general but of a Minor Meeting, for settling clerical differences, you describe as wild and preposterous rant. Yet this is the doctrine of the Conference, which says:—"If there be a difference between two preachers in a district, the respective parties shall choose two preachers; and the chairman of the district, with the four preachers so chosen, shall be final arbiters to determine the matter in dispute." So you yourself accuse the Conference of wild and preposterous rant! And is Mr. Samuel Jackson also among the Reformers? I have heard many strong things from them, but nothing to surpass this. I have heard the bad laws of the Conference described as "baubles for priests and fetters for fools;" but never as wild and preposterous rant, as "monstrous and unheard-of doctrine," till you made the discovery. But, for you to say that my "case depends" on this doctrine, is certainly monstrous and unheard-of misstatement.

Besides, it must also be recollected, that the Minor Meeting for whose finality I contend is not merely a Minor Meeting under the aforesaid law, but also one from which no appeal is claimed or made; whose operation is unresisted, unquestioned, immediate, and complete; which was never cognosed by any higher tribunal; and the bare rehearsal of whose proceedings is officially and personally resisted by the defeated party. All this your logic finds it convenient to overlook and omit.

You say that "if the decision of a Minor District Meeting may be set aside at all, the means of doing it is altogether a secondary consideration." Of course, in the school of Protestant Jesuitism, the end warrants, and even sanctifies, the means; and, in the school of Wesleyan Cliqueism, the means of setting aside a Minor Meeting is a purely secondary consideration, provided it be done for the sake of the Clique, and by members, or servants, of the Clique. Mr. Bromley was expelled to maintain District Meetings; and the Missionary clerks are eulogised for impertinently, clandestinely, usurpingly, and iniquitously overturning, or attempting to overturn, a constitutional District Meeting, that was final in fact as well as in law, and against whose procedure not a single charge has ever been substantiated. It is easy to talk of the procedure of this meeting as "unprecedented and extraordinary," without, at the same time, fairly saying what that procedure was, and without reference to the fact, that the defeated party declined and resisted every proper means and opportunity of cognosing his opponent's language, and signed the record that there was no objection whatever to any brother in the district.

You say that I am indignant because the memorial "was not read in full to the Conference, and discussed at length there." You know full well that I do not complain that the 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 a hundred