

he has, we repeat, carefully kept that treatment out of sight. He says, "the probability is that a Presbytery would take no notice of it at all." Whether wise or unwise, the pursuance of this course, we maintain, involves the exercise of no positive disciplinary act—neither small nor great—nor of any degree. It is nothing more than giving the *go-by* to the case. There is then no real "contrast," except as we would contrast something with nothing. Now we ask him to tell us in plain words, what, in a case precisely "similar" to the one which engaged the attention of the Conference, would be the positive discipline or treatment of Presbyterianism: reminding him, however, that he is to "say nothing as to the righteousness or unrighteousness of the judgment" that may be pronounced, but confining himself solely to the "ample warrant," the "peculiarities" which Presbyterianism confer, "for the course" that may be adopted. We shall wait, with no little curiosity, for the required explanation. When this is afforded, we shall be able the better to judge of the claims he puts in for the "superiority" of Presbyterianism.

Nor is this all. He speaks of the "peculiarities" of Methodism. Now in establishing the superiority of Presbyterian, to Methodist, discipline, the instances cited must possess something *peculiar* to Presbyterianism—something exclusively its own—something which distinguishes it from Methodism. Otherwise there can be no "contrast" between the two. But, if silence, or the taking no notice of, or action on, the case, constitutes a disciplinary act, is that *peculiar* to Presbyterianism? Was not that course open to the Conference? Was there, or is there, any thing in Methodism to prevent it from pursuing the very course the *Witness* affirms a Presbytery would in all probability have followed? Did not the Conference pursue that course, that is, taking no action on the case, for four years? And, had it deemed it the better way, might it not have continued that course for four, or twenty, or for an indefinite number of years more? And if it had, would it then have been at least equal to Presbyterianism? Where then, we again ask, is the vaunted superior "peculiarly," in point of discipline, inherent in Presbyterianism? If this attempt at "illustrating" this "superiority," be not the very lamest ever made, it is the lamest we ever witnessed, and we submit, that it is crippled in every limb—in fact, to use rather an inelegant expression, it has not a leg to stand upon.

We have not overlooked the concluding part of his Letter. But we respectfully tell him, the case there introduced has nothing to do with the subject under discussion. On his own representation, it is totally *diverse* from the one on which the Conference acted. This the *Witness* well knew. As unfair as illogical, is it, to test a principle, by illustrations drawn from subjects perfectly irrelevant. The introduction of that extraneous matter may serve to produce an effect—but it can produce no favourable conviction on an enlightened mind. Does he know the course Methodism would pursue in a case analogous to the one exhibited in the latter part of his editorial—that is, in which "doctrinal points," "error and heresy," were involved?

The fact is,—and this is the point which the *Witness* has not touched,—the late case of discipline before the Conference was *special*, out of the ordinary course of things, and required special dealing. It does not therefore exhibit the usual mode of disciplinary procedure in the Wesleyan Connexion.

But when this extreme case arose, the Conference, from its recognized and well understood usages and laws, had power to grapple with it, and dealt with it, accordingly. And as the full merits of this extraordinary case shall become known, we have no doubt, the action of the Conference upon it, will receive the justification of the Christian public.

In conclusion, we again express our sincere regret, that the Organ of the Free Church in this Province should have acted so inconsiderately—to use a mild term—towards the Wesleyan Church, which from the first has stood forth as the friend and advocate of the Free Church of Scotland, and at times when that friendship and advocacy were valued and valuable, by citing the cases of the late Conference discipline in a way calculated to disparage our Church.

Amicos res optime pariat: aduersus probant.

Denominational Colleges.

We are not sorry that the secular Press is beginning to agitate the subject of denominational colleges. The opponents of these Institutions, however, cannot expect to have the matter all their own way. The Religious Press must, and will, speak out. To be silent now, is to betray their cause. As opportunity offers, and inclination leads us, we shall, from time to time,—not needlessly offensive we trust—advocate our well known, and long cherished principles. The discussion shall be conducted on our part, not with reference to the *political*, but on the higher ground of the *religious*, bearing of the subject.

We notice in the *Tarmonth Herald* of the 20th, a communication on this *verata* question, containing, as we think, strong and unwarrantable assertions. They are mere *brutum fulmen*, calculated to frighten rather than convince. The thunder reverberates on our ear, the lightning flashes upon our eye, harmlessly. We have a conductor, not far distant, which secures our safety.

At present we feel ourselves called upon to deal with one statement of the writer, leaving others, with which the article abounds, to future animadversion. It is as follows—
"Let sophistry twist the matter in every variety of shape—let disclaimers be put forth—let sectarianism be denied in the most solemn and emphatic manner; yet no one doubts that Sackville Academy is entirely subservient to Methodism, &c."

And this bold declaration is signed "A Methodist!" *Et tu Brute!* We question the truthfulness of the designation assumed. The sentiments of the whole piece betray, to our minds, the hand and the heart of one, who talks much of "men's consciences," and "first principles of religious liberty." But we may be mistaken. We state our misgivings only to put our own people on their guard. This writer may be, in reality, "A Methodist;" but then we can scarcely, on proper grounds, account for the palpable ignorance he displays of the real character of Sackville Academy. He will read our remarks, by the kindness of the Editor of the *Herald*; and we challenge him to sustain, by proof, his allegation against the Wesleyan Academy at Sackville. The question to which we now restrict him is the following—

"Is Sackville Academy entirely subservient to Methodism?"

We shall allow no questions foreign to this to be introduced. One thing at a time is our motto, in all discussions. He has already answered the question in the affirmative. We deny it. Will he accept our challenge? We shall expect to meet "A Methodist" on this field of discussion.

The Difference.

In commenting on the late expulsions from the Wesleyan Connexion by the Conference, the *Church Times*, insinuates that Mr. Shore's offence, for which he was incarcerated by the Bishop of Exeter, was of a character similar to that for which the expelled ministers are suffering. Has our contemporary so soon forgotten, that the crime for which Mr. Shore was punished by his diocesan, was, for preaching the Gospel of Christ in what is called a *dissenting*, that is, an unconsecrated building, after he had seceded from the Church of England? The offence for which the Conference expelled the Ministers in question was for refusing to submit to the known laws of the Connexion *while they were members of it*. The cases are not parallel, and so the "wonder" of the *Church Times* may pass for a harmless exclamation only.

Cases of Conference Discipline.

We refer those of our readers, who take an interest in the recent acts of Conference of a disciplinary character, to our second and third pages for opinions expressed by some of the English Journalists on the subject, and to the letters of returned Missionaries contradicting in the most positive terms the malignant reports circulated against our Missionary Executive in reference to the Jamaica District. We have not the slightest doubt that the honoured ministers, who have been for some time past the objects of the most unprincipled and slanderous attacks, first anonymously in the vile and shameful "Fly-Sheets," and now by the open agitation and calumnious charges of the expelled ministers, will come out of this warfare entirely unscathed, and will be justified in the opinion of all who take an honest and candid view of their proceedings. The decision of Conference was in our judgment altogether righteous—in strict accordance with Methodist law and usage—and, considering the determined contumacy of the individuals, unavoidable.

We have no sympathy with the agitators. Their misrepresentations will sooner or later, we are persuaded, recoil with tremendous force, upon themselves and their abettors. Many of our people who take sides with the expelled, are, at present, beyond doubt, under the influence of erroneous views, not perceiving the real merits of the case. The excitement, we trust, will subside; and as calm and sober reason is allowed to exercise itself, the sophistry employed will be detected, and they will wonder how they could permit themselves to be so lamentably deceived. The disaffection I will try to make the most of the present crisis, but they will be for evil powerless, as the sound and loyal come to a better state of mind. That they who are inimical to our ecclesiastical organization, and denominational movements, should countenance and abet those who are evidently seeking to revolutionize and destroy the system of Methodism, as it was, and as it is, is nothing more than might be anticipated; but God who has been with it, and is still with it, will defeat all their machinations, and restrain the wrath of men, and override it to the advancement of his glory, and to the real prosperity, strength, and unity, of the Connexion.

LIBERATION OF DR. ACHILLI FROM THE INQUISITION.—We are happy to be able to state that in traditions are gone from Paris for the liberation of Dr. Achilli. When we say this, we of course take it for granted that the Cardinals have no ground against him, except such as are simply religious. And if so he will be liberated. Since the above was written, we learn that the order of the Council for Dr. Achilli's release is imperative, founded on his being arrested in the name of the French power. We believe that the use of the name of the French Prefect can

be proved by several witnesses, so that we must trust that, through the Divine goodness, Dr. Achilli will soon be out of the clutches of the unrelenting enemies of God and man.—*Christian Times*.

PASTORAL LETTER.—The annual address of the British Conference to the Methodist Societies in connection with that zealous body of Christians, has lately been published, and contains many excellent practical advices and exhortations suited to members of other religious denominations, as well as their own adherents. It enters very fully, with much earnestness and affection, into a lengthened statement and recommendation of the institutions and observances of the Christian religion, and dwells with peculiar force and energy upon the duties of personal and family piety. We cannot find space in our columns for the whole of this address, but have much pleasure in recommending the two following extracts to the serious and devout attention of our readers, as enforcing duties of no ordinary interest and importance in these stirring and troublous times.—*Guardian*.

The extracts need not be given, as the entire address has appeared in our columns. A friendly notice in these times does one good.

Tribute to Methodism.

I have always entertained a sincere regard for the Methodist body, especially in England, where they are vastly more respectable than they are in this country, and more useful—though few in our new States, they are very useful pioneers. I have also the greatest love and veneration for the character of Mr. Wesley, and especially for Mr. Charles Wesley. I do not much wonder that they "went out from us," as I fear I must affirm, especially the former. I lament that with Venn, Berridge, Walker, Simson, and a host of others, they did not take up their cross, and remain really in the Church, to purify and adorn it. O what a spectacle to men and angels would the Church of England now be, if such had been their course. Experience has shown how capable she is of being reformed—what reformation has been made, and is now going forward, nevertheless, I am sensibly alive to the good the Methodist body has done and are yet doing, and live in the fervent hope, that as the Church is really improving every day in all that God requires of her, we may yet see our Methodist friends again connected with and made one with us, as Christ is with God, and we hope to be with him.—From "Correspondence" in the *Church Times*.

That wish, however pious, we can scarcely believe will ever be realized. The time has gone by for the Wesleyans to be absorbed in the Church of England. The respective bodies are better as they are. This is the opinion our best and ablest men take.

SECESSIONS FROM THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.—We lament to state that an effort is now being made to draw off from the Established Church of England a large number of the clergy, in order that they may adopt "Independent" principles, under the leadership of a member of a noble house (Gainsborough) whose secession has during the last few months excited some attention. The names of several excellent men have been handed to us as having intimated their intention of joining the new movement, and many others, it is said, are "halting between two opinions."—*Cambridge Chronicle*.

SYNOD OF THE EVANGELICAL CHURCHES IN PARIS.—There is another congress at Paris now, which will, perhaps, affect the country more deeply at some future and not very far distant period than this peace congress. In consequence of a general assembly of the Reformed clergy of France, held here last year, having refused to have a confession of faith, (the majority of the meeting were Rationalists,) some distinguished ministers and laymen seceded from the National Church; and last Monday they met here with the pastors of various small independent churches, and labourers employed by the Paris Evangelical Society, to agree upon terms of union between these different branches of "the sacramental host of God's elect." Twenty-seven churches or stations of the Evangelical Society of France have sent deputies to this Conference. The Free Church of Scotland, and the United Presbyterian Church, have each of them sent two deputies. The Rev. Frederick Monod was chosen president of the assembly, unanimously. On Sunday there was a communion-service at Mr. Monod's meeting-house, presided over successively by ministers of different denominations.—Presbyterian, Wesleyan Methodist, Independent, and in which the communicants were at least five different sections of the Christian Church.—*Paris Correspondent of the Advertiser and Journal*, August 23.

