:inianism as maintained and propaga-
the Wesleyans" as scarcely *popish*,
ation which he has dared still more
ely to repeat in his last week's edi-
-and yet this faithful *Witness*, this
gelical Advocate," this "lover of
truth," now, after we had exposed his
ty, his dodging the points at issue, his
of proof, turns round, and, with the
effrontery, "begs to assure" a "high-
ected Wesleyan Minister"—who was
nt of all the facts of the case, and who
imself "sincerely congratulated" us
"good temper and christian courtesy"
pelling the unkind and unmerited at-
of "the Free Church *Presbyterian*
s upon the 'whole system' of our doc-
and ecclesiastical polity"—that he has
'dragged—stage by stage—with deep
—into this dispute or altercation—and
altogether—by reason of the insinua-
nd petulance of the *Wesleyan*"!

WITNESS is guilty of further misre-
tation.

assigns as a reason for his not admit-
e letter of the Rev. E. Evans into his
ns, that, "he was not receiving even-
d justice from the *Wesleyan*." Let us
se this "insinuation" to be well foun-
-the greater, then, was the propriety,
ronger the reason, that he should allow
etter in question to appear in his co-
, as he could expect nothing short of
-handed justice" from that "highly
cted Wesleyan Minister." We do not
me to judge of other men's motives;
us, it appears strange conduct to ex-
the article of one person, because ano-
person was supposed not to be dealing
even-handed justice"! A cogent rea-
surely! An "admirable illustration"!
t to the insinuation itself, we plead not
. We have done the *Witness* justice—
justice—"even-handed justice," if he
It is true, we did not literally comply
his unreasonable request, to insert his
editorial on the subject in discussion en-
-the latter part of which on his own
ng had no relevancy to the question be
raised. On this ground any Editor
be charged with injustice. Had we
nded of the "even-handed" *Witness* the
sion of one of our own replies, even
ing throughout on the merits of the
would he have yielded assent? If so
haps we may yet test his sense of
n-handed justice." But why does he
e us for that of which he has been pal-
guilty himself, by flatly refusing to in-
n his own columns the letter of the Rev.
vans? This is "even-handed justice"
a *witness*!
t him turn to the *Wesleyan* which ap-
d next after his imperatorial request
issued, and he will find, that, though
xcluded the irrelevant matter, we did
the substance of his introductory re-
s, and word for word of all that really
ed the case, not overlooking his
mirable illustration;" and if he will re-
o our issue of Sept. 29th, he will further
both the introduction and all the matter
inent to the case, quoted *verbatim et li-
ra*. Nor in all our replies have we fail-
o state what he may call his arguments
what we designate mere assumptions—
g them in his own words—placing them
e strongest light—and "manfully" deal-
with them. But this course the *Witness*
s pursued. He has avoided coming
close combat—shunned the sharp points
ar defence—and contented himself with
rifles only. Nor has he advanced one
's breadth from this—to him safe, but in
, —disingenuous course. We have

found it impossible to bring him to close quarters—he is lost at a long shot or playing at *long bowls*—he may be seventy-four rounds out of the [illegible] opportunity of joining—perhaps he is keeping his *ammunition* in reserve.

The WITNESS shifts the ground of his original "illustration" of the assumed superiority of Presbyterianism over Methodism.

He now seeks to divert our attention to topics other than those with which he commenced his crusade. We see through the soft disguise, and it is vain he spreads his net. He asks us now to "give him something like justice"—that we have done again and again one would suppose to his heart's content—"face the argument fairly and honourably"—what argument? He has not given us *the* argument, but has abounded in assertions without proof—we cannot face a non-entity—"and manfully test the regulation of 1835, to which allusion has so often been made, by the light of Scripture, of sound reason, of common sense."—We might justly decline this "test," as it is a departure from the ground of our assailant's original charge against the Wesleyan Conference, as he well knows, that at first his "test" was—"we say nothing as to the righteousness or unrighteousness of the judgment." But now finding his first ground untenable, he seeks another. Hence he urges us "not to attempt any longer to spread a thicker volume of mist around the evil itself, by the defence of an Act admitted—to be perfectly consistent with the evil itself." "Then," says he, "shall we be in a fit position to grapple with you"—this implies he is not now in a fit position to grapple with us—so we have thought from the beginning—"and to show," he proceeds "wherein we conceive, consists the superiority of Presbyterianism over Wesleyanism, in matters of discipline"—this implying also that he has not been in a fit position to show that superiority! We are glad to discover that our opponent is coming, though slowly, to a correct apprehension of his real "position."—We have been telling him all along that he was in a false position, and that he had by no means succeeded in showing "the superiority of Presbyterianism over Methodism in matters of discipline." But if we "test the regulation of 1835," *then* he will be in a "fit position" to make good all that he has hitherto been essaying to do—but in vain. We shall see.

This "test" he evidently considers his stronghold—or a battering-ram with which he will be able to demolish the citadel of Wesleyan discipline. Hence the following challenge,—

"Let him (the *Wesleyan*) plainly and distinctly tell us what he thinks of the Notes, and on the Standards of the Wesleyan Conference, and then we shall be in a position to go through with the subject."

Let then the *Witness* hear what we "plainly and distinctly" say. We believe the Conference law of 1835 is in accordance with "Scripture, reason, and common sense"—and essentially too—say to the harmony of a Congregational Ministry such as the Wesleyan Ministry confessedly is. Now the Witness is "in a position to go into the whole subject;" and, when he shall have exhibited that law *in all its parts* and *bearings*, and brought it to the test of Scripture, reason, and common sense, it will be time enough for us to enter upon its defence.

The WITNESS seeks also to shift the ground on which he impeached Wesleyanism as being POPISH on essential doctrines.

He does by no means, however, withdraw the accusation itself. "We are sorry," he says, "we cannot, from any thing we have yet seen, retract one syllable, and that because of our love for what we hold to be God's truth." He however we "will distinctly deny" that the Wesleyan Body "does not hold the distinguishing characteristics of the Arminian system, then" he "shall at once make the most ample apology." Distinctly *deny* that the Wesleyan body *does not hold!* Pray what does this mean? Surely the *Witness* must have been in a "volume of mist" when he penned that admirable and lucid sentence! We presume he meant to say, if we would *assert* that the Wesleyan body did not hold, &c. He then asks us to tell him "seriatim, yea or nay, whether the Wesleyan Methodists in these Provinces do or do not maintain the Arminian views—on election, original sin, the extent of the atonement, the resistibleness of divine grace in the conversion of men, the doctrines of justification and sanctification, the perseverance of the Saints. If," however, we say that our body "does not hold the Arminian views on these points," then also he is "ready to make the most ample apology" for his unjust charges. But if we are "obliged to acknowledge" that it does hold them, and he intimates that he rather thinks we "will be obliged to do so," if we "take the Notes on Wesleyan Methodism, by Dr. Bennett," (formerly) "Editor of the *London Watchman*," for *our "guide*, as these are given in the *Christian Treasury* for 1847, then" he "cannot retract one syllable of what he has already advanced." "However grating," he continues, "it may be on the ears of some, reverence for the sovereignty of Jehovah, and a simple regard for divine truth compels" (compel) him "to reiterate the saying, that Arminianism, in all its essential characteristics, is nothing but Popery revived in a new form." So ends this chapter of the slanderous Witness! And what think ye of it, ye followers of the *evangelical* JOHN WESLEY? Is not this calumniator of his "Wesleyan brethren" a modest man—a theological *savant*? Is not his christian liberality beyond all praise?

We need no more than the above questions he proposes—the appeals to *our* knowledge of Arminian views—the reference to Dr. Bennett's Notes in the Treasury for 1846, we beg to say instead of 1847, as quoted by our accurate cotemporary—to show that he has felt himself hardly pinched by our former appeals to his sense of justice. Has he not assumed a competent knowledge of the whole system of Wesleyanism? Why then ask us what *we* know of Arminianism, and what *we* think to be the theological views of the Wesleyans in this Province? Why appeal to the Notes of a person whom we recognize not as a standard writer on Wesleyan Methodism, though his statements as far as they go may be correct, and who, in the very "Notes" to which we have been referred, distinctly says, that "the responsibility of the accuracy of his statements must rest exclusively on himself as an individual?" The *Witness* must not think thus easily to slip through our hands by such trifling as this. He must give Wesleyanism, or Evangelical Arminianism, something like justice, or our repeated challenges of proof fairly and honourably, test his accusation by an appeal to Wesleyan Standards, and prove not that Wesleyanism on some non-essential doctrinal points is opposed to *Calvinism*, which is not questioned, but that on such essential doctrines as *original sin*, and *justification by faith*, it "is nothing but Popery revived in a new form," which is flatly denied. He must place Popery and Wesleyanism in juxta-position, and show their identity; and we again call upon the *Witness* no longer to slink away from this duty part, but if he have the honour of a man, as I any real regard to 'God's truth' to meet our reasonable challenge honestly.

GENERAL DAY OF THANKSGIVING.

We understand that the *Twentieth* day of this month has been appointed by His Excellency, the Lieutenant Governor, to be observed throughout the Province as a day of General Thanksgiving to ALMIGHTY GOD for our merciful deliverance from Cholera, with which other portions of the empire, and of the world, have been desolated, and for the temporal blessings with which we have been favoured. Such a public act we hold to be perfectly right and Scriptural, and highly befitting our circumstances. If God is to be acknowledged in his punitive administrations, it is equally his due, and our duty, to acknowledge his over-ruling Providence when he deigns to shield us from ravaging disease, and bestow upon us unmerited mercies.—Nor will we as a people, it is trusted, be backward, by the praises of our lips and the devotion of our hearts and lives, in returning to the Lord "according to the benefits we have received." We think, however, there has been a laxity in giving due notice of these public announcements to the Ministers of the different denominations in various parts the of Province, who are expected to lead their people and congregations in these religious and solemn exercises. It is not sufficient merely to publish the "Proclamations" in the Royal Gazette, as many of the ministers have no opportunity of seeing that Paper. Nor should they be required to depend altogether on statements made by other Newspapers in these momentous matters. The "Power" that appoints or recommends days for general humiliation or thanksgiving, should in another way, we would respectfully suggest, secure a proper notification to the parties so deeply interested, and on whom so much depends as to their due and orderly observance. This we know is the course pursued in a neighbouring Colony. We attribute the neglect of a similar course in this Province to oversight alone; and hope that in future measures will be adopted for conveying proper information to Ministers of all denominations, so that they may make timely arrangements for the general devotional services which may be contemplated.

NEW EDITION OF THE HARMONICON.

WE acknowledge the receipt of a copy of the *Third Edition* of the Harmonicon, published by J. Dawson & Son, Pictou. We do not feel competent to give an opinion on the merits of this collection of Sacred Music, though the names of many of the tunes are quite familiar to us. The Press we believe speaks favourably of it. We copy the following Notice from the *Guardian* of the 30th ult.

In this edition the Publishers inform us that they have made improvements which they trust will greatly increase its usefulness and extend its circulation.

"More than fifty carefully selected tunes and pieces have been added to the work, and I also that of that number of tunes, which have fallen into disuse since the former editions were printed, have been omitted.'

The appearance of the third edition of the Harmonicon, on good paper, and clear type, is highly creditable to the taste and enterprise of the publishers, and cannot fail to enhance its value in the estimation of the public, which has already pronounced its favourable opinion of the utility of the work by the encouragement given to two previous editions.

Rev. Dr. King's Letter.

WE direct attention to the Rev. Dr. KING's letter which appears in another column, and in which he and his colleagues the Revs. McKENZIE and HONEYMAN, he denies all connection with the offensive editorials recently published in the *Presbyterian Witness* against the Wesleyans. We think it right to [illegible] that though we have heard rumours to the effect that the Rev. Dr. King's colleagues had contributed to that Paper, we think his own name nor that of the other of his colleagues was the one given under the circumstances to which we have made reference. His disclaimer for himself and colleagues we cordially accept; and we can assure him that no one more sincerely regretted the uncalled for and "absurd" attack on Methodism by the *Witness* than we; as we saw, that, if persisted in, it would have a tendency to bring the Free Church and the Wesleyans into an undesirable and unseemly collision. We fear that feelings have been excited by the unchristian and illiberal tone of the *Witness* which it will not be easy to allay. For with the ostensible object of the *Witness* as the advocate of Free Church views and principles, the acceptance or patronage of it, as such, by members of that Church, its free use as the medium of Synodal and other authoritative communications for her office-bearers and members, the acknowledgment by the Proprietor of his reception of editorials from Free Church Ministers, and the avowal by an authorized Agent that a Free Church Minister of this City was its Editor, not yet disclaimed, it will be difficult to convince the unsophisticated that the *Witness*, though not the *officially* recognized, is not truly the "virtual" or "constructive" organ of the Free Church; though the courteous disclaimer of such respectable and influential Ministers as Dr. King, and Messrs McKenzie and Honeyman, will go far to show that all the Ministers of the Free Church do not sympathize with the spirit of the *Witness*, and to prevent the destruction of those friendly relations which have subsisted, and have been maintained between the two Churches. A few more such disclaimers would place the *Witness* in his right position before the christian public, reduce him to his just proportions, and strip him of his fancied importance; and we sincerely hope that these will be forthcoming. How pitiable must now be his situation, how unenviable his feelings, when he finds that "the exhibition presented in his journal," has so truly "mortified" such worthy ministers of the Free Church as Dr. King and his colleagues. We feel heartily sorry that he has had it in his power to injure the feelings of such honoured men; and would advise him, if insensible to any other motive, to allow this one to operate as a check upon his exhibition of further calumny.

We find no fault with the Rev. Dr. King for plainly asserting that he "holds most firmly by the doctrines of the Confession of Faith" and "believes that their Presbyterian principles have a divine warrant." Nor will he respect us the less, we are persuaded, for our openly avowing that we hold firmly by the doctrines of the Wesleyan Standards, and believe that the Wesleyan principles have a divine warrant. Without this mutual concession, he could not be a consistent Free Churchman, nor we a consistent Wesleyan. But this difference of opinion on points of doctrine and church polity, which each may hold to be important in themselves, but which neither believes to be essential to personal salvation, may well consist with true christian principle and the exercise of sincere christian affection. On this basis the Evangelical Alliance has been formed, constituting a plat-form on which evangelical christians, who "agree to differ" in certain matters, may meet in common brotherhood and advance the urgent claims of Christianity. Such was the friendly relation which the Wesleyans cultivated toward the Free Church in these Provinces; and if it has been at all interrupted the blame lies at the door of the *Witness*, who has just cause to afflict his soul for the unchristian work in which he has been engaged. We need to make no apology for saying, that we cannot quiescently allow damage to be attempted even by professed friends to the religious system in whole or in part, to which we, in our conscience, adhere, when he have the means of vindication so amply at hand.

Increase of Members.

A copy of the General Minutes of the Annual Conference has just been laid upon our table. We are happy to see that the Methodist Episcopal Church, within the last year, has been blessed with the large increase of 23,219 members and probationers, and 106 preachers, travelling and local. For this gratifying result we hope the Church will offer to God a tribute of grateful praise. Let the watchmen upon the walls of Zion take courage. God has not forsaken his people, but still continues to hear their prayers, and crown their labours with success