class above all subsequent efforts—I mean the Venus Anadyomene." At these words a deep blush overspread the fine features of the Signora. She made an effort to speak, but hesitated; and Walstein, whose eyes were earnestly fixed upon his picture, resumed,—"The form and features of Arria are a composition of my own, and painted entirely from ideal conceptions; but the Venus," continued he, blushing in his turn, "was taken from a reality of splendid and almost superhuman beauty. Poets prize those compositions which are founded in nature and ennobled by art far above the mere imaginative in poetry, and the same rule applies to the sister-art of painting.—Thus, Dante and Michel Angelo, Ariosto and Titian, Tasso and Raffaelle, were respectively animated by the same spirit; and their compositions prove their profound knowledge of human and external nature, and, at the same time, their deep and comprehensive sympathy. How greatly would all the arts benefit were the votaries of each in more intimate communion; but it is the calamity and curse of fine art that its disciples too often want bread. The fear of destitution fosters a mean spirit of detraction, and divides those kindred minds, which were intended to develope and improve each other'—

"But, my good Leonardo!" interposed the laughing Cecilia, "what means this excursive rhapsody,—this misanthropic display of the shades and blemishes of your profession? Cheer up, I pray you, and shew me the other picture."

"Signora!" replied the painter, in great and obvious embarrassment, "you must excuse me. I cannot—*dare* not, shew you that picture."

"Hah! There is some mystery connected with it!" exclaimed the Signora.

"There is a mystery," replied Walstein, "and one which nearly concerns you."

"Me Leonardo!" exclaimed the excited Italian; "then I must and will see it."

"On condition only that you pardon my presumption," said the young artist as he placed the penitent Magdalen before her, and her own exquisite form and features flashed upon the astonished Cecilia. "Gracious Heaven! it is myself!" exclaimed the lovely singer, while her fine countenance was suddenly flushed with anger and amazement. "It is my very self," she repeated, as she compared her features in a mirror with those of the prostrate Magdalen.—"Leonardo!" she continued, with trembling vehemence, "why did you paint me in that unveiled and meretricious form? Why as a Magdalen? And how could you accomplish it? You must have basely stolen on my privacy." Tears of indignation rolled down her cheeks, and impeded farther utterance. "Pardon me, lovely Signora!" exclaimed Walstein, "if I dared to borrow the most perfect of Nature's works to illustrate a popular subject. Your unrivalled features were engraven on my memory, and the ardent imagination of a young artist easily supplied those beauties which your unaffected modesty concealed. Have not painters, too, a professional and inherent right to avail themselves of every beautiful object in art and nature? And where could I find a model so perfect, a combination of form and feature so exquisite and rare, as that I have dared to employ?"

"Leonardo!" exclaimed the angry Signora, with an incredulous shake of her beautiful head, "that resemblance is too accurate to be the work of memory and imagination. But you may yet have cause to rue this boldness. The just anger of an insulted woman is not to be soothed down by flattery, and my friend the Earl of C. will call to severe account the man who dared to expose me to public derision as a Magdalen. No, Leonardo! I deny that any artist is privileged to trample upon the feelings of others; and, if you would avoid my enduring hatred, and the active vengeance of Lord C., you will not hesitate to make the only reparation in your power."

"Name your conditions, Signora!" replied Walstein, whose consternation had rapidly subsided, as he observed a lurking smile on the cheek of Cecilia, which disarmed her language of its terrors.

"You must relinquish, at your own price, both these pictures," said she. "On no other terms can you ever hope for mercy."

"Then I am pardoned," replied the painter. "I abandon unconditionally to you and the tasteful Lord C. two pictures, which the sordid traders of Nuremburg are unworthy to possess."

The Signora opened her writing-desk, and put a heavy purse of gold into the painter's hands. "This is on account only, Leonardo," said she; "it is all I can at present command; but in a few days I shall see Lord C., who is now in Lausanne, and surprise him with these admirable pictures. He often speaks of you with warm regard, and his fine taste and boundless liberality are well known to you."

"I have indeed good reason to recollect them," replied the grateful artist; "but for these two pictures your generosity has already overpaid me."

"And now, Leonardo, I have a favour to request of you," resumed the Signora.—"If your time and engagements permit, you must paint my portrait once more for Lord C.; but I will have no poetical accessaries—no attributes—you must paint neither Venus nor Magdalen, but simply Cecilia G. as she is before you. Ere long the Earl of C. and I shall part, too probably for ever. After a long and affectionate intercourse with this high-minded and accomplished nobleman, my heart drops when I look forward to our final separation, and I think I should find relief in having my portrait taken before his arrival."

While thus speaking, a hectic glow darkened the cheek and brow of the lovely Italian, and her eyes filled with tears as she concluded.

"Name the day and the hour, Signora! and I will attend you," replied Walstein, with heartfelt sympathy, "nor will I intermit until the portrait is completed."

"To-morrow morning, then, at ten," said Cecilia.

"I will not fail," replied the painter, rising to depart. He kissed the hand of the lovely Italian, cast a look of lingering affection upon his favourite pictures, and hastened from the apartment to conceal the bitter regret with which he relinquished them for ever.

[TO BE CONTINUED IN OUR NEXT.]

UNIVERSITY REFORM.

One of the most important measures which will be brought before Parliament at the coming Session, is the Bill for an alteration in University of King's College. For years past it has proved a bone of contention, and up to the present period remained little less than a monopoly in the hands of one sect, which has assumed to itself all the importance of a State Church, looking down upon and treating other creeds as contemptible interlopers, existing only by sufferances. The first charter was obtained by lying and fraud, and although public opinion was too strong to enable the parties to hold it, the amended charter has not been carried as its framers doubtless expected it would be; and the consequence is, that a rich endowment, intended for the youth of Canada, has been mismanaged and squandered by a *sect*, whose followers have derived nearly all the benefit that was to be obtained from such an institution. Bills for doing away with the abuses existing, and intended to place the institution on a more liberal footing, have repeatedly been before the Legislature; but during the whole time the Tory party were in power, they were only used as decoy-ducks, to make a show of redeeming Draper's pledge, and delude those who were weak enough to believe the protestations of men whose actions belied their professions. Fortunately, the inhabitants of the Province could see through the hollow professions of the party, and when the time arrived, they triumphantly placed in power men whom they had reason to believe would endeavour to make the public institutions of the country national rather than sectarian ones; and one of the best proofs that can be given of their earnestness will be the framing of a liberal and just measure for the future management of this institution. The *Globe* and *Examiner* have both published outlines of what they state will be the Ministerial measure; the latter of which we published in the last number. The main features of the plan fully meet our approbation although on some points there are grounds for difference of opinion. The total exclusion of instruction in theology gives ground to hope that sectarianism and priestly assumptions will find no place within the walls of the institution, though we have some doubts as to the prudence of admitting a representative from each theological seminary to a seat at the Council Board. By some it is stoutly opposed, whilst others think it a prudent step, and in a case where the prejudices of the community have attempted to be roused by the cry of a "godless institution," it is perhaps advisable to present every guarrantee to well-meaning but bigotted individuals, who can see nothing good unconnected with the priestly office. The proposition that every representative must be graduates of the Toronto University, will not be tolerated for one moment, if it is intended to take immediate effect; and we decidedly object to it under any circumstances. There are other points to which we intend to refer when we see the bill itself, for it is difficult to form a decided opinion on every part until the full details are open for inspection.—*Guelph Advertiser.*

THE PRESS.—Never, in all our reading or experience, have we met with anything so preposterous and unconstitutional as the arguments raised by Col. Gugy, in the case of Gugy *vs.* Hincks. The argument we refer to at present, is—that whatever produces "*uneasiness*" in the mind of the individual looking for damages, is a Libel! Such a doctrine might suit under a despotism, for the worst of purposes; but surely, under the British constitution, and in the nineteenth century, it will be scouted by every intelligent mind, and the plaintiff using such an argument sent to Coventry, or consigned to the care of some benevolent keeper of a lunatic asylum. Suppose, for a moment, that such a doctrine had been adopted by any nation, now enjoying the blessings of civil and religious liberty, can we reasonably conclude, that with such a law of libel, either the one or the other ever would have been conceded? With a law so stringent, and so crushing, how could reform in church and state ever take place? Kings have been made "uneasy" by the press, when it advocated the constitutional liberty of the subject; our own John's and Charles's and James's have been made uneasy, no doubt, by the Press, in advocating the rights of the people. The ecclesiastical authorities have been made "uneasy," when their assumed authority has been questioned by the Press; but, nevertheless, the Press continued to do its legitimate work, and hence our glorious reformation.

That man cannot be a lover of the rights of humanity, who would advance such a doctrine; and we do hope, that when the irritation of the actions in which Col. Gugy has been engaged shall have subsided, that he himself will concur with the general opinion of the Press, and doubt his own position.

The blighting, withering sarcasm of Mr. Drummond, in the defence, must and will have its effect; not, certainly, in giving aditional obscurity to that "obscure" man, Gugy, but in holding him up to scorn and utter contempt of community, so far as the liberty of the Press is concerned, and he as its expounder.

To the Press we owe all the liberty we enjoy, as nations and individuals, and the man who would abridge it of its legitimate rights, is consequently the greatest enemy of a people's rights.

We regret that the late verdict in Gugy *vs.* Hincks, was not a verdict on the merits, but on the question of proprietorship.—We look with anxiety to the next of the series, and if it appear that any law of this province would 'crib, cabin, or confine" the Press, within the limits laid down and depended on by Col. Gugy, then let the Press do its duty in claiming an amendment of the law. This course we suggest, not for the benefit of the Press, but for the benefit of the people, whose representative the Press is. We are not the advocate of a licentious liberty of the Press; we advocate the rational rights of the Press. What would community be, if the gagging doctrines of Col. Gugy were the law and practice of society? Every species of injustice, tyranny, peculation and oppression, would be practised, and we should have no remedy; because, forsooth, the minds of the lords of misrule would be made "uneasy" by the exposure of the Press, and the last hope of an injured people would be taken from them, in the suppression of the Press.

We sincerely hope that the province does not contain another individual that would come into a court of law with a demand so outrageous as that made by Mr. Alpha and Omega Gugy—we beg his pardon, we have not the means at hand of selecting from the alphabet, that portion of it which he monopolizes and glories in.

We will return to this subject, and shew the claims of the Press on popular respect and support, whilst it confines itself within its own proper limits—the advocacy of Truth, and the rights of the people. We have a salutary dread, however, on our minds, of course, to everything that would give "*uneasiness*" to a mind so sensitive.—We conclude with a quotation from one of our good old English authors:

"But man—proud man—
Dressed in a little brief authority,
Plays such frantic tricks before high heaven,
As makes even angels weep."—*St. Catharines Journal.*

PHRENOLOGY.—Dr. Russell's lecture before the Mechanics' Institute, on Thursday evening, was attended by a very large and intelligent audience, who listened with intence interest to his able and comprehensive delineation of the principles of Phrenology. The lecturer, after giving a general outline of organology, or the external part of the science of Phrenology, and after making some general allusions to geological discoveries, the lecturer expounded the great phsiological laws by which man is related to the physical, organic, and spiritual worlds. He then adverted to the moral bearings of Phrenology, in reference to education, politics, medicine, criminal jurisprudence, and prison discipline, proving most conclusively the great importance of Phrenology in all the relations of life.—*Montreal Pilot.*

HURON SIGNAL.

FRIDAY, DECEMBER 29, 1848.

THE TRUSTEES.

A VERY SMALL STORY FOR VERY SMALL MINDS.

Some time ago an alteration took place in the Board of management of the Grammar Schools in this District, but the *thing* was so very trifling—so truly unimportant to the cause of Grammar and every other cause, principle and person, that we never entertained the slightest intention of noticing the occurrence. But the *thing*, with all its insignificance, has given a mournful illustration of the truth of the old maxim, that little minds are moved by littie things," and our *Devil*—who is always seeing or saying something that nobody else can see or say—avers that he had lately seen some drops of blood upon the snow, together with something that seemed to be a piece of an under lip, strikingly resembling the curled lip worn by one of the "cashiered" Trustees; he therefore wishes to insinuate that the said cashiered Trustee had, in chagrine and righteous indignation, bitten off his own lip! From this doleful intelligence, we entertain some slight apprehensions that George Frazer, Esq., Coroner, will shortly be under the painful necessity of returning a verdict "Died of mortification caused by political spleen!" we consider it an editorial duty to lay a correct statement of the facts before the public.

It appears that the Trustees of the Huron Grammar Schools were originally four in number. That the Hon. William Cayley; out of respect either for the County or for some individuals, obtained the appointment of five additional Trustees. Some of these new members, however, were unfortunate enough to possess a glimmering of common sense, and dared to propose that the opinions and interests of the public ought to be equally consulted with the opinions and interests of the Teacher. This was quite an innovation on the established mode of doing things in Huron, and accordingly it at once led to an "antagonism" in school government. Mr. Cayley was again applied to, and again generously got four more members addeed to the Board of Trustees. The original four had got along pretty well, upon their principles of action, but now that they had increased to *thirteen*, they could not act at all. And sometime in the course of last summer, they had got complely at *sixes* and *sevens* on the question whether the Teacher, Mr. Haldane, should or should not make Pricks for four weeks, at the expense of the parents of his pupils. This was rather an awkward question in English grammar, and an application for a solution to it was forwarded to the government. The government met the difficulty by throwing away eight of the discordant members of the Board of managemeut, and adding one to the remaining *five*. Two of these five, we believe, rejoice in the name of Radical; the other three, we suppose, will be content with the name of Conservative: at all events, the whole five were men of Mr. Cayley's recommending, and, under a Tory government, were considered "fit and proper persons" to fill this office. The Radical government are merely responsible for the appointment of *one* of the present six Trustees; and we must take the liberty of stating our own opinion, that in the appointment of that *one*, they have been guilty of a slight error. In appointing the Rev. Alex. McKid they appointed *one great Tory;* and though we care very little about politics in these matters, yet, from a very *water-gruel* kind of an article published by the Tories the week before last, it appears that the appointment of the Rev. Alexander McKid has been a disastrous—a doleful appointment! Perhaps the manufacturer of the said *water-gruel* intended to be ironical in his denunciations of the Radical government for this appointment, but if so he has failed to make himself understood, and no intelligent man can draw any other conclusion from his silly childish driveling, than that the five trustees, when appointed by Mr. Cayley, were "fit and proper persons" for the office; but that the Radical government, by uniting Mr. McKid with them, had not only metamorphosed them into a mass of ignorance and stupidity, but had also destroyed the efficiency of Mr. Haldane as a Teacher!! on this view we think his Reverence should reject the appointment, as it is certainly not "fit and proper" that a Clergyman should occupy the character of an evil-doer—at all events he might seriously pray "Save me from my *friends*."

We do not feel surprised that such an article should be written; because we are aware that there are brains and minds sufficiently weak and confused for the perpetration of anything in the shape of abortive composition; but we certainly are surprised at men pretending to common sense, countenancing or patronizing such trash.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.—A number of Communications have been postponed for want of room. "Allan Cameron's New-year's Compliments to the *Cur*," will appear in our next, also the remainder of our Stratford Correspondence.

"A LAYMAN."

As our readers must be getting tired of gazing weekly on the portrait of this unfortunate individual, whose canting hypocrisy and malicious perversions of truth are already before them in all their naked deformity, we shall bring our criticisms to a close as speedily as possible: but the cloven foot of his Reverence is not yet fully unveiled. In his printed production of the 13th of October, he says—"I shall not be prevented by any threats of exposure, or any ungentlemanly, or uncouth epithets from laying bare the mischievous tendency of this man's writings." There is no charge here: it is merely one of the *mad dog* hints; one of the dastardly insinuations which is the potent weapon of every malignant hypocrite. The sum and substance of all accusations—the groundwork of all his fiendish efforts to arouse popular indignation against us—is found in the expression "We do not believe the scriptures on this subject." This expression we *did* use. The meaning which we attached to it, and which could not be misunderstood by any boy of ten years of age who heard it, was simply this:—that men whose uniform conduct is a manifestation of practical wickedness—whether that wickedness consists in drunkenness or in some other vice—are not Christians,—do not believe the Scripture declarations against wickedness. They may be members of a Christian church; they may profess their faith in the dogmas and doctrines of that church; and may even be prepared to resist to the death, the man who would dare to doubt or dispute the truth of these doctrines. But though they should profess to believe by the lump, all the religious doctrines that have ever been propounded since the days of Adam, yet, so long as their conduct is evil; so long as they are wedded to their idols or favorite vices; so long as, like "A Layman," they cherish in their hearts a hostility to the cause of truth and righteousness, their profession,—their *believing* is only a "whited sepulchre, full of dead men's bones." They are not Christians; their *faith* is a sounding brass; they *do not* believe the Scriptures."—In making these allusions to drunken professors of Christianity, we did not mean some kind of rare, frightful monsters, that might be supposed to exist somewhere far away on the remote verge of creation. We meant the drunkards of Goderich; men who are members of Christian churches; who are *great believers*, so far as profession goes, and who in dishonor of their "solemn baptismal engagement," get frequently overcharged with surfeiting and drunkenness." In short, we meant the drunkards whom we were addressing at the time. The men who attended the meeting for the sole purpose of encouraging and cheering on the little champion of drunkenness, with whom "A Layman" has so zealously made common cause, in quibbling and wresting and perverting truth. We wished to convey to these deluded beings the all-important and unbending truth, that so long as they continued in their shuffling, quibbling, tippling career of guilt, their profession of faith, their church-going propensities amount only to a mere sham. Their religion has neither soul, substance, nor reality in it. It is a fearful, and a fatal delusion, which will recoil upon their own souls. This was our meaning in using the expression "We do not believe the Scriptures on this subject." The "*we*" was used as a common form of speech in public speaking: and as we remarked before, our meaning was distinctly understood by every one in the meeting. There was not one of even the drunkards present, who did not both understand and *feel* our meaning. It is true "A Layman" was *not* present, but we have no doubt his *friends* from whom he received his information, would give him a fair statement of our sentiments and the proper application of them, and leave the torturing and twisting of them to his truth-detesting abilities. Accordingly he comes out boldly, and states that we openly in the house of God, avowed our disbelief in God's word, and that, too, in the presence of a number of Clergymen!!! This statement, carries its own evidence of its falsehood; and though it had been published in a community where the circumstances and facts were entirely unknown, its author, had he published it with his name, would have been hooted for his audicious presumption; that is, unless he had been, like the wretched creature that insulted the meeting, so totally and notoriously depraved, that nobody would take the trouble of *hooting* him. But the unfortunate being who writes in the name of "A Layman" has given mournful evidence that he is sufficiently depraved for anything that is evil, while at the same time he is too cowardly to assume the responsibility of his guilt.

We were requested, by some *good* men, who were present at our Lecture, to publish that portion of it which had been so wickedly misrepresented, and we did so. We published nearly two columns of it, and it has since been published by other editors, both radical and tory.—But notwithstanding all this; notwithstanding the fact, that every boy in Goderich had an opportunity of exhibiting the daring and malignant falschood of "A Layman's" assertion, the poor godless and abandoned creature persisted in his wickedness, and repeated his assertion that we had denied our belief in the word of God! He was aware that he had already subjected himself to the scorn and detestation that morally attaches to the anonymous ruffian or the hidden assassin; but he was also aware that so long as he was able to skulk behind the cloud of the coward, he could still continue to insult the public with, at least, personal impunity: and no amount of evidence, written, printed or verbal, could have any effect in causing him to retract his malignant falsehood. The extract which we printed contained the following passage in reference to practical Christianity:—

"I believe it to be a religion of universal love, of forbearance, of mercy, of self-denial, and of charity,—requiring all its professors to love even their enemies, simply because they are the workmanship of the same God, and to hate them would be to despise their Creator; requiring us to forgive each other's offences; to sacrifice our dearest desires and inclinations, and to exert every possible influence for the moral and spiritual welfare of our race; to live at peace with all men; to avoid temptation, or being the means of tempting others; to live soberly, righteously, and Godly in the world; and to do good unto all men as we have opportunity. This I believe to be the substance of the moral teachings of Jesus."

Upon this passage, "A Layman" offers the following strictures:—

"I affirm, sir, without fear of contradiction, that there is nothing in the version of Mr. McQueen's lecture, as published by himself, that in any way controverts my assertion, that he is not a believer in what the religious public understand, by the doctrine of christianity. I am prepared to maintain that in Mr. McQueen's confession of faith there is nothing, (in spite of his much talk about christianity) that is inconsistent with the most damnable doctrines of the Unitarian, the Socialist, the Owenite or the Universalist.

"All these heritics *profess* to believe 'the christain religion to be one of universal love, of forbearance, of mercy, of self-denial and of christianity' they believe all this, and they have an *historic* "belief in the *moral* teachings of Jesus; but sir, do they believe in the miraculous conception—do they believe in His divinity—do they hold fast the faith once delivered to the saints, that faith which alone can make them wise unto salvation?

"In first taking upon myself the task of pointing out, through the medium of your paper, the baneful principles of the *Signal*, it was not my intention to allude to the religious professions of Mr. McQueen, further than they were mischevously advanced in the paper which he edits, and I regret that he should have found it necessary to publish a declaration of his faith, for those the least acquainted with theological controversy, will detect unsoundness in his religious principles."

Now, it must be borne in mind, that we did not give any "confession of our faith," for these reasons. In the first place, the principle which we were advocating, has no necessary relation to any abstract religious doctrines, it is a principle of practical morality; and may be equally embraced and acted on by the Jew and the Greek, by the Pagan, the Mahometan, and the Christian. In the second place:—We had no right and no desire to call together an assemblage of the people of Goderich composed of all the different religious denominations, and insult them by detailing our own peculiar sectarianism; neither would the people sit to listen to any such outrageous conduct. For however orthodox the opinions of "A Layman" or ourself may be in our own estimation, they would have sounded very hetrodox in the ears of at least two-thirds of that large meeting. In the third place: we did *not* give "a confession of our faith" simply because we have never been in the habit of judging mankind by the quality or quantity of the doctrinal creed which they profess. Their *faith* does not effect us. To their own Master they stand or fall, in this respect. We deal with their conduct. If a man is practically wicked, his profession of an orthodox creed does not make him a good man; and if he is upright, his speculative errors do not destroy his uprightness. These being our views on this subject, consequently we never make any enquiries about any man's faith, and we feel exactly the same objection to trouble any man with a "confession of *our* faith." It is only such canting, cowardly, surface men as "A Layman," that impertinently interferes with other men's faith.

In giving what we conceived to be a brief abstract of Christian morality, we had no intention of giving a single doctrine, or any sentiment that could be conscientiously disputed by even the Unitarian or the Universalist. We merely wished to embody a few of the plain, practical precepts of the New Testament, in as few words as possible. We did not hunt up the knotty points on which human creeds are founded. We did not wish to bring forward such points as Unitarians and Universalists and Socialists would *not* believe; but such points as even "*A Layman*" could not deny. We think that not only the Unitarian, the Socialist, the Owenite, and the Universalist," but also the Devil; and even "A Layman" do believe in the precepts which we selected. The difference between the faith of the Devil and the faith of the Layman being simply this:—that while the Devil "believes and trembles" he has no power to act in accordance with his faith; but "A Layman" in a state of probation, possesses the power and refuses to exercise it. Now, "A Layman" either knew, or did not know, that the precepts which we brought forward had no reference to peculiar modes of faith, either orthodox or heretical. If he did not know this, then, we are willing that the tenor of his strictures shall be ascribed to his ignorance of Christianity. If he *did* know, then the malignant intention apparent in his strictures precludes us from expressing his dispositions by any other term in the English language than that of "*incarnate demon.*" In either case, it is a matter of mournful regret to all good men, that such a character should be allowed to write or even to *speak* about anything connected with religion. Continued in our next.

MORE LAYMEN!—A young lady friend of ours who possesses much shrewdness in connection with much waggery, informs us that *somebody* has, last week, written upwards of two columns, over the signature of "A Layman" with the intention of rescuing our Reverend cousin from the gulph of infamy into which he is rapidly sinking. She farther saith, that the said production is at least half-a-remove below the lowest species of *twaddle;* and that it merely proveth two things,—first, that the writer is not *the* "Layman," and second, that the writer has *touched a Bishop!* whether at the *paps* or the *purse, deponent saith not!*

TO THE EDITOR OF THE HURON SIGNAL.

GODERICH, 26th Dec., 1848.

SIR,—With reference to the various letters which have appeared in the Huron Gazette signed "A Layman," and the Editorial articles relative to them which have been published in the Huron Signal.—We the undersigned abstain from expressing any opinion as to the merits or demerits of either. But as you have assumed that the writer of the letters is a Clergyman, and continue to assume that he is so, by styling him "our Reverend friend a Layman;" and as it is well known to us the undersigned, that only two of our resident Clergymen were absent on the occasion of your Lecture, we are of opinion that your observations on the subject, are calculated to wound the feelings of those Gentlemen, and may seriously impair their usefulness as Clergymen. We therefore deem it our duty to inform you that *we know* the author of "A Layman," and we say positively that he is not a Clergyman, and has, therefore, no claim to the title of "Reverend."

We request as an act of justice to the only two Clergymen that could be referred to, that you will give this a place in your next number.

We are, Sir,

Your obedient servants,

A. W. STRACHAN,
DAVID SMITH,
JOHN CLARK,
JOSEPH WILLIAMSON,
D. WATSON,
A. F. MORGAN,
HENRY REED,
ALEX. ROBERTSON,
THOMAS KYDD,
ALFRED W. OTTER,
J. B. GILES,
WM. ROBERTSON,
ROSS ROBERTSON,
JOHN STRACHAN,
J. K. GOODING,
I. RATTENBURY,
WM. BENNETT RICH.

EDITOR'S REMARKS.

We publish the foregoing declaration, simply because we are not aware of one instance in the whole course of our life, where we have *knowingly* "wounded the feelings" of an innocent human being. At the same time we are sorry to see this declaration brought before the public. And before giving the reasons for our regret, we will offer a few remarks on the character of the productions which have called forth this declaration. To every reasonable man who reads the foregoing document, these questions must necessarily occur, "What are these productions of "A Layman," from an imputation of whose authorship almost every man recoils with the same horror that would make him shrink from the plague or the cholera? What an awful amount of guilt must be involved in them, when men holding a fair character in the world, will display such solicitude, and anxiety, and trouble in obthining the publication of a document intended to rescue even their remote acquaintances from the suspicion of the authorship? Are these productions calculated to advance the cause of morality or religion? Are they calculated to make mankind better? In short, are they *true?* If so, why were they published anonymously? Why should good men or *honest* men refuse to sanction, with their names, the straightforward course of truth and righteousness?

These questions we say, will necessarily occur to every reasonable man who reads the above document; and as it will be read by thousands who never saw the productions of "A Layman," we will answer these questions as briefly as possible. Our political opponents in Goderich discovered, before we had been long among them, that in writing on politics, or in laying down principles and defending them—they would come off rather worse than second best. They discovered that they had got a troublesome customer to deal with. One who was neither to be bribed, nor browbeat, nor swerved, nor intimidated from his purposes by human influences. One, who, in defence of what he conscientiously believed to be right, would just take *breaking on the wheel* as cheerfully as any other kind of amusement. In fact they discovered that we would exactly accomplish the purpose for which we had come—viz: "*Radicalise*" *the District of Huron.* They saw their occupation like Othello's, was gone. And like the dark-souled villians, who in every age of the world have become callously saturated with guilt, they concocted the scheme of ruining us by raising the mad dog cry of infidelity against us. The productions of "A Layman" are, therefore, a series of publications got up for this purpose, and purporting to be strictures on a public Lecture, which we delivered in town on the 4th of September; on the subject of Total Abstinence. The character of the productions may be summed up in few words. From beginning to end they breath all the dark insinuating truth-preverting malignity of the Wicked One, and we do believe that even a fiend from the internal regions would blush in acknowledging the authorship.

Such are the productions of "A Layman."—Our fearless, rigid, honest criticisms on them, appear to have struck terror to the hearts of the concocters—not any moral feeling of compunction—of this they are not susceptible; but a kind of selfish, cowardly, pecuniary dread seems to have come over them. And we understand that they have puff'd up poor little Giles, who cannot possibly be injured by anything that may be attributed to him, to say that he is the author of them!! They might just as plausibly have attributed them to the brazen fish on the top of the flagstaff! The other two, who are willing to share the guilt with the unfortunate little creature, are depraved, and black-hearted, and malignant enough for all that is nefariously wicked—but they lack the ability—they might act the *rascal*, but they have not talent to act the villian.

We regret the publication of this document because it is signed by seventeen men, some of whom have a fair standing in society, and we think upon due consideration they would not have made any such declaration. They all declare that they "*know* the author," and we will be charitable enough to suppose that some one of the notorious *trio* told each of them that *he* was the author. This is poor evidence. Not long since there were some of the most solemn voluntary declarations that could escape the lips of men, made against the authorship of the two blackguard productions that appeared on the *colored wrapping paper*. And yet it could be proved that these producrions were written and carried to the printing office by the very men who made these "solemn voluntary declarations!" And, reader, these were men who make a considerable *fuss* about religion! and would have sworn to their declaration if required. But in the second place, we are sorry that some of these seventeen men should have attached their names to the foregoing document, because it places them in a very awkward position.—The productions of "A Layman" resulted from malignity—they abound in gross and unqualified falsehoods—they are wilful perversions of truth, perpetrated in the name of religion, with the in-