

of the Church. But we now come to a more serious subject, that of the inconsistencies in Dr. Ryerson's public writings, involving violations of truth totally incompatible with the character of a preacher of the Gospel—such as would subject a private member of the Church to expulsion,

In entering upon a part of our subject so delicate and so painful, we once more invoke the candid and serious attention of the old and experienced members of the Church. We ask them this question, "If there be any abuse, ought we, who know it, to speak or to be silent?" If we are willing to take all the reproach, censure, and condemnation, we should justly deserve on being found slanderers: if our character for veracity either cannot be impeached, or if found vulnerable, we are willing to be exposed to public contempt and disgrace, ought not the members of the Church to hear us patiently? Is it an offence to speak of these things? If it is not, it is our duty to speak, and the duty of our brethren to hear. If it is, then the discipline operates to prevent the disclosure of abuses, to prevent reproof for sin, to shut up the sources of advice and improvement, and, being contrary to the word of God, ought to be immediately altered. Again, we ask, are those who point out and prove the existence of abuses against either members or people, disaffected towards the Church, and its enemies? Would they not be enemies if they held their peace? What says the Scripture, "Thou shalt not in any wise suffer sin upon thy brother." We shall, therefore, endeavour to perform a painful duty in pointing out some of the inconsistencies and contradictions in which Dr. Ryerson has involved himself, and if the unavoidable inference be, that he has been utterly regardless of truth, it cannot be laid to our charge.

On the 29th of May, 1844, Dr. Ryerson announced his intention to offer to the public some remarks in defence of Sir Charles Metcalfe. On that occasion he said, that he had not thought proper to accept the office of Superintendent of Education. We suppose he meant the office of Deputy-superintendent, for the Chief-secretary is *ex-officio* the Superintendent.

The article preceding these remarks proves, that at Cobourg, Dr. Ryerson had received the offer of that office, and we have the testimony of the Ministers of the Wesleyan Methodist Church, that he had accepted it. That testimony dates in March and April previous. All that was not consummated in the business was the announcement to the public of his having accepted the office, which, for prudential considerations, was to be deferred till his defence of Sir Charles Metcalfe was concluded. Here, in May, he denied accepting the office, while in March and April previous we can prove he had accepted it—while, to make this falsehood more palpable, he tells the public, in a letter to the editor of the *Examiner*, dated October 22nd, that he never heard of the vacancy of that office until August following. Here mark the jesuitical expression, he did not hear of the vacancy, surely not because Mr. Murray was to occupy till Dr. Ryerson was fully ready to take his place.

The next subject we only notice in reference to Dr. Ryerson's inconsistency, not, in the least, with a view of reference to politics. In pursuing his course as defender of Sir Charles Metcalfe, he informs the Canadian public, that in India there is an equality of civil and religious privileges, from which assertion he infers, with other qualifications, the complete adaptation of Sir Charles Metcalfe to the duties of Governor of Canada. Now, is it true, that in India there is an equality of civil and religious privileges? With respect to civil privileges, there is not the least truth in the assertion. First, there is no representative system of government in existence there; secondly, to this moment all offices of responsibility are filled by a class of people who were, and perhaps are, agents of the East India Company, all Europeans without exception. Would Canadians say that there was perfect equality in the enjoyment of civil privileges, if no persons were to be found filling offices of honour, responsibility, and emolument, but natives of England? Such is the equality in India.

With reference to the religious equality in India we are not sufficiently acquainted with the subject, but we believe that the same attempt at ecclesiastical supremacy is made by the Church of England there, as in other Colonies, and that the actual inferiority to them of other denominations is sufficiently felt.

When conscience clearly indicates a duty, there is no occasion to resort to casuists; but such is human nature, that in general men never resort to casuists, but when that faculty clearly points out their duty—it is because conscience is against them that they go to these arbiters, as Saul went to the Witch of Endor because God had forsaken him.

Dr. Ryerson may have had forbidding qualms of conscience on the subject of Clergymen discussing political questions. He, therefore, goes to a Doctor of Divinity—we do not say a casuist nor a Witch of Endor—but he goes somewhere for directions how to violate a plain command and obligation previously binding on him, "You have nothing to do but to save souls, give thyself wholly to them." This Doctor of Divinity is a *very eminent one*, of the Wesleyan Methodist Connexion in London. Now, there are so few Doctors of Divinity in the Connexion, that there is scarcely a chance of the appearance of a very eminent one, about six is the average number in the Connexion.

We suspect this flattering title of "very eminent" is given for the purpose of showing the pains taken by Dr. Ryerson to go to the highest source for advice, and of making an impression among those who know very little of Methodism in England. We do not wish to see Methodism lowered in public opinion here, but this reference to very eminent Doctors of Divinity among the Methodists in England would certainly do so—it would cause both them and the writer to be laughed at.

To the praise of the person, whoever he might have been, "He deprecated any religious body having any connection with secular party politics," and the same accommodating Doctor thought, "That a Minister who had been endowed by his Maker with talents, and possessed the qualifications to discuss questions of government, was responsible to God for their exercise, as well as for any other means of public usefulness, when the general interests of the country demand their use."

The advice given is quite in accordance with that of the ancient oracles, giving the enquirer a shadow of excuse for the course he might take, without giving him liberty to take any.

On the subject that Ministers of the Gospel have other work, and that there are others to do the political work of the age, and that Dr. Ryerson was not called to it, we might say much more, but we have not space, and wish to keep close to our subject.

We take the liberty to ask, why he did not consult the word of God, and the discipline of his own Church, instead of a *very eminent Doctor of Divinity* in England. Had Dr. Adam Clark been alive to be consulted, he could have given a very different answer to that of the *very eminent Doctor of Divinity*.

Nearly every unbiased person has regarded the boasted liberality of Lord Metcalfe in donations to Churches and public Institutions as a part of his policy in securing parliamentary influence, as well as that of the act of engaging Mr. Ryerson to defend him before the public.

Mr. Ryerson contradicted both; the first, by praising Lord Metcalfe as a "fortune spender in the country from which it is attempted to ostracize him," and by characterizing those imputations as "groundless and malicious," and of "unparalleled meanness." The second, by responding to the charge that he had been hired, by giving the editor of the *Examiner* such a form of denial as is quite consistent with the truth of those charges. He first says, "Had this been the case it would not have falsified my arguments;" and, also, "you adduce not a shadow of proof in support of them in your charges;" and, again, "Up to this time (Oct. 22nd, had never received one farthing;" and, further, "nor was any pecuniary inducement so much as hinted at, nor have I received a penny to defray any expense which I have incurred in various ways, in my defence of his Excellency."

We shall give the contradictions to all these statements from Dr. Ryerson himself.

In his letter before us, to the editor of the *Examiner*, Oct. 22nd, he says, "When his Excellency learned in August, that I desired not merely to go to England with a view of promoting the interests of Victoria College, but to travel on the Continent, and to investigate the Educational system of the most enlightened nations of Europe, and that I did not wish to undertake the duties of the Educational office (which I learned at that time,

for the first, was about to become vacant), he was pleased not only to approve of my views but considered such a tour of enquiry of such importance to the Province, that he not only expressed a willingness to countenance it by the sanction of his name, but with his characteristic princely liberality spontaneously offered to render any other assistance necessary to promote, to the greatest possible extent, investigations and enquiries so obviously calculated to advance the best interests of Canada." We ask if a promise of "princely liberality," made in August, was not equal to cash Oct. 22nd, when he said, "Up to this time I have never received one farthing?" From the date of the promise in August, he could, undoubtedly, draw on the Governor at any time as pleased, no doubt it was polite to refrain until he had finished his defence, when the spontaneous writing could be more conveniently paid by equally spontaneous liberality; when we can prove, that he was actually in the receipt of £375 sterling, or about \$1800 currency, per annum, at that time, having actually accepted the office of Deputy-superintendent of Common Schools, by our testimony in March and April, and by his own in August; and when we see his admission of a promise of "princely liberality" in August, with what truth could he say in October, "nor was any pecuniary inducement so much as hinted at?" We request the Methodist community to take this in connection with the evidence of two members of the Conference, one of whom said, that it was understood that he was not to enter on the duties of his office till after Conference; that he had accepted the office in question in March and April, and to reflect on these facts. Further, on the subject of giving money to the various religious denominations, we have his own declaration, that it could only be considered as bribing them. While he was editor of the *Christian Guardian*, and writing in support of the Mackenzie agitation he says:—

"A Protestant Government here is endowing the Episcopal Clergy with one seventh of the Province, the Catholic Clergy with £1,150, and the Kirk Clergy with £600. And a professedly Christian Government appropriates the revenues of the country, to the support of the Clergy of these contradictory creeds. Now suppose an individual to lend his influence and assistance alike to support these various creeds; which would be the natural and legitimate inference? Would it be that he believed the truth of all these creeds?—This is impossible. Could it be that he believed the truth of any one of them?—This is equally impossible, for his supporting all, is arming one against the other—a kingdom divided against itself—pulling down with one hand, and building up with the other. Would not the inference then be that such an individual has no real faith in either of these religious creeds; but that he pays a bribe to the clerical advocates of each, provided they all advance his political purposes."

Lord Metcalfe has done the very thing here pointed out by Dr. Ryerson, and according to him could have no real faith in either of the three creeds mentioned, though he devoutly attended the English Church. Had his political opponents said so, in the recent dispute, the *Colonist* and *Christian Guardian* would have added each another five columns, dilating to the utmost on the uncharitableness of the imputation. They, however, only agree with Dr. Ryerson, that the just inference would be that such an individual was bribed. As he is one of the parties bribed, though not one of those enumerated by him, but a clerical member of another Church, we only assent to his own doctrines by stating that the object of the Government was to bribe him, for again, he says in the same letter, "could any other inference be drawn, respecting an Administration that should pursue the same policy." He perhaps, little thought when he wrote this a few years ago, that he would be describing the conduct of the Administration in 1844, and his own, in similar circumstances pointed out by himself.

In page 162, section 2, of his pamphlet, Dr. Ryerson says that the partisans of the Toronto Association have endeavoured to make the Wesleyan Methodist Church a party to their proceedings against Her Majesty's Government and the Governor-General. At the time this was written, there was no Government in the Province, but that of the absolute authority of the Governor-General, and it was sufficient to excite the indignation of every British subject against such a usurpation, without the assistance of any Association. But has not Dr. Ryerson throughout the defence, especially in the appendix, endeavoured to make the Wesleyan Methodist Church a party to his proceedings against the liberties of the people? Is