

# TORONTO PERIODICAL JOURNAL. OR, WESLEYAN METHODIST.

"THE TRUTH SHALL MAKE YOU FREE."—John viii. 32.

VOL. I.

TORONTO, FEBRUARY, 1845.

No. 2

**T**HE TORONTO PERIODICAL JOURNAL;  
or, WESLEYAN METHODIST, published  
under the Superintendence of a Committee—Mem-  
bers of the Wesleyan Methodist Church.

Price Two Shillings and Sixpence for Six Months,  
from January 1st, 1845; payable in advance.

Persons remitting Ten Shillings will be entitled to Five Copies, or Friends who will kindly procure Two or more Subscribers, and by remitting the Amount to the Address of the Publisher, will receive a Copy gratis.

**NOTICE TO SUBSCRIBERS**

NOTICE TO SUBSCRIBERS.  
All Communications are requested to be addressed to the Editor, No. 57 Box, Post-Office, and to Messrs. Lesslie Brothers, King Street, Toronto, where the Paper is for Sale.

Toronto, 1st February, 1845.

## THE WESLEYAN-METHODIST.

"When preachers of the Gospel become parties in party politics, religion mourns, the Church is undivided, and political disputes agitate even the faithful of the land. Such preachers, no matter which side they take, are no longer the messengers of glad tidings, but the senders of confusion, and wasters of the heritage of Christ"—*Life of Dr. Adam Clarke*.

TORONTO, FEBRUARY, 1845.

*Jurius' Letter—Continued from last Number.*

Governor General not be realized, the disgrace must fall on him who excited them; and hence all the policy of a political sophist will be used to pervert the judgment of the community. But it is a fortunate circumstance that that community is too well informed concerning great occurrences to submit their judgment to the ever varying schemes of violent partizanship. The many failures attending this individual's public career, are too fresh in the minds of the members of his own communion, to allow them to place any confidence in his opinions. Never, perhaps, have as many miscarriages fallen to the lot of

have as many misadventures fallen to the lot of any one man during the course of a short life. A restless, meddling spirit has meddled with and marred everything upon which it hastouched. Those peaceful societies were torn asunder and shaken to their very centre by the same agency, in the union with the English Conference. Had we listened to the wise counsels of the Fathers of the Church, this disgrace had not befallen us. I speak not against either body. I honour them both. But the Toryism of the English Wesleyans could not harmonise with the political views of Egerton Ryerson, however Conservative he might have become while breathing the atmosphere of England. That same childlike agitation which was instrumental in uniting, forced upon the two gree bodies the necessity of a separation. They were subsequently driven to do what they would never have done, but for the circumstances which, created for personal purposes, compelled them to the performance of acts, which inflicted deep wounds upon the hearts of those venerable and prudent servants of the Church. Who, after considering that last, violent, schoolboy act of the reverend gentleman, on his departure

from London, can suppose that a grave body will allow themselves to be influenced by the author of such actions?

Other considerations will show this to be an unfortunate appointment for the Government. Those who have supported his Excellency during the present crisis, will not look upon this act as a reward for their services. Tories and Churchmen have been the most prominent supporters of his Excellency since the resignation of the Ministry. This appointment is conferred upon an enemy of "the Church" and a former Whig. Whether this transformation into a Tory will also metamorphose his enmity to the Church of England into friendship time will prove. Nor is it flattering to the many learned men of the country, that one represented to be of slender attainments in a few common branches of English education, and totally ignorant of mathematics and classics, should be entrusted with the education of the country, many of whose youthful scholars have attained higher knowledge than their Superintendent. The County, Township, and City Superintendents frequently require assistance and advice in the selection and examination of teachers. But to whom are they to go?

There is yet another objection to this appointment, I contend that no violent political partisan ought to be entrusted with the office of Superintendent of Education. The country will not be satisfied and will justly doubt the wisdom and sound policy of the Government in such an act. Education ought to be kept as free as possible from all political influence. It will not be satisfactory to state that the office is not a political one. It is enough to know that the incumbent is the most violent political partisan in the country. That this will have its influence facts might be adduced from colleges in operation even in this Province,—but I forbear for the present.

JUNIUS.

We are under the necessity of withholding a number of articles referred to in our last number, though we promised them in this. Having received other important communications, which more than supply the place of those omitted, and which answer the same purposes as facts in support of various assertions made by us, we hope the omissions will be excused. The following letter, however, being one of them, we cannot omit, as it proves that the Rev. Egerton Ryerson did attempt to use the columns of the *Guardian* in defence of Sir Charles Metcalfe, notwithstanding his denial to the contrary:—

COPY OF A LETTER WRITTEN TO DR. RYERSON, BY MR. SCOTT, IN REPLY TO A LETTER RECEIVED FROM MR. R., ON THE SUBJECT OF A CERTAIN POLITICAL ARTICLE, SENT FOR INSERTION IN THE *Christian Guardian*.—[No! send but another instead.]

MY DEAR BROTHER,

On \* a a \*  
reply to my Letter of the \* a a n  
Guardian of your article \* a a e  
the Governor-General," &c. \* a a

I regret that in the commencement of your letter, you among other things equally severe, say, "I will never bear for the

columns of the *Guardian*, I will go to another journal first." Let me observe, I never wished you to "beg" for any thing of the kind. You sent me an article for that paper, and I conscientiously stated to you my fears that its publication would infringe Conference rule, and asked you permission for me to consult the Book Committee for advice—a duty imposed upon, and a privilege allowed me, when as the Editor, I am in a difficulty respecting an article sent me for insertion.

insertion.  
You say, "I think that the notice of the Reform Dinner, the insertion of Mr. Hinck's speech, (only a few of our people can tolerate him, though they respect Mr. Baldwin,) and several other things have given a party bias to the *Guardian*." I reply, that the "notice of the Reform Dinner," is a mere common news item, like other notices of the election of members of Parliament, &c.—without any expression by me of political or party views. Mr. Hinck's speech is an avowal of sentiment, on the University Bill, and not of political views, or views of his party. His sentiments accord with those of our College Board, your articles, as well as my own published in the *Guardian*.

If, as you intimate, I have published articles having a party bias, I know it not, and am ready to receive the just condemnation of the Conference. I thank you for your suggestion relative to the guarding of our people, against undue excitement at the present critical time, and, should I find them in spirit, going too far in public matters, I will avail myself of the suggestion, and tender them a little religious advice.

mer part of your article should  
*Guardian* without any alteration,  
your permission to drop certain  
I feared were objectionable, but  
I yet fear that nearly all  
tion of Dr. McCaul, if inserted  
ference directions, and greatly  
our happy Church. I take  
that portion of your article, I am now speaking of,  
to be, in general, a sentiment of your mind on certain  
political subjects, and especially a favourable expre-  
sion of your views of the position of one of the po-  
litical parties n<sup>o</sup> in contest. I mean that of the  
Governor-General, and, therefore, consider, that my  
publication of such an expression from the powerful  
pen of one of the most influential ministers of our  
Church, would be deemed by the Conference a violation of  
the law.

If it can be shown that my apprehensions on the subject are groundless, most gladly will I change my present disagreeable position towards you; for I do not as you well know, like to differ with you on any subject. Such being the state of the case, I am compelled to repeat what I said in my last, that I see waterly unable to send you a final decision respecting the insertion of as much of the article as you specify, and cannot do it without the direction of the Board Committee. I wrote again, therefore, to ask your permission for me to consult them.

I remain, yours affectionately,  
**JONATHAN SCOTT.**

From the Christian Guardian.

We announced, in our paper of Dec. 18th, that some anonymous persons had shown a forwardness to seek and expose some trifling flaws relative to some Ministers of the Gospel. We said that a friend had 'volunteered to hear what proofs are possessed for what has been said.' The proofs have been called for 'Have they been afforded?' No. Then the character of the writer is in no degree advantaged by his writings, which manifest a flaw in his disposition, greater perhaps than that of which he complains. We should not notice the subject but for the *Examiner* shutting up his columns against further communications. We are not sorry for this. Yet it is necessary for our respected friend to say through us, as he cannot through our contemporary, that he regards the late reply to his call for proofs of prior charges as no answer at all. Not only is there no proof,