

act as a son in the Gospel." What is the duty of a son to a father? It requires no philosophy to answer this question; any peasant I apprehend would reply that it would be the duty of a son, to answer a civil question when proposed by his father frankly and promptly.

Mr. G. declared that he fully approved a code of discipline that authorized the elders of his church to enquire every day into his behaviour. He solemnly attested that he approved of the "Minutes" which say: "Let them speak freely to each other: Let them never speak slightly of each other in any kind." Nay, more he promised at his ordination, reverently to obey those chief Ministers, unto whom was committed the charge and government over him; and to follow with a glad mind and will their godly admonitions, and submit themselves to their godly judgments." But when an enquiry is instituted as to whether these promises have been kept, and these engagements have been observed, there is a cry raised that this course is "novel, illegal, inquisitorial, despotic, un-English, un-Protestant, un-Wesleyan, and un-scriptural."

That it is not novel, is evident; for John Wesley instituted "a close examination into the Preachers' characters," in the year 1777. That it is not Methodistically "illegal," appears from the laws and precedents above given. That it is not improperly "inquisitorial," is manifest, for John Wesley said, "Examine THAT one by one." Mark, "Examine THAT," the enquiry having been raised, it is not said, their case was examined, but, "examine them;" John Wesley's own words. That it was not thought to be "despotic" is clear, for the preachers in John Wesley's day submitted to it, and "the examination was attended with much good." That it is not un-English is known to everybody who has any knowledge of what takes place in England, for explanations, admissions or denials, are sought, demanded, and found, nearly every day in the year. That it is not "un-Protestant," is clear, for it is the very essence of Protestantism to try to discover the truth, whatever may be the result. That it is not "un-Wesleyan," is most manifest, for the method originated with John Wesley, in 1777, or earlier. That it is not "un-scriptural," is proved by more precedents than one. There was an evil in the camp of Israel. And Joshua said to Achan, "tell me now what thou hast done, hide it not from me." Joshua preferred no charge, and yet he called on Achan to confess. Eli suspected Hannah, and he questioned her, "How long wilt thou be drunken?" Hannah was innocent, and she at once said, "No, my lord, I am a woman of a sorrowful spirit; I have drunk neither wine nor strong drink, but have poured out my soul before the Lord." She gave him an honest and candid answer, and Eli said, "Go in peace." I Sam. i. Saul preferred no charge against Jonathan, but he knew that something which operated injuriously had been done; and he said to his son, "Tell me what thou hast done." I Sam. xiv. Peter preferred no charge against Sapphira, and yet he said, "Tell me whether ye sold the land for so much?" Acts v.

We thus see that a long list of epithets may be strung together, which may sound very harsh and appear very formidable, but when they are examined, they are only the dust which are blown up to blind others. This shows the necessity of a calm and deliberate examination of such bold assertions. The boldness of the assertion does not prove its truth. May our Christian brethren learn to exercise that moderation which ever indicates that the mind is under the operation of divine grace. That peace may be found in all the palaces of Zion, is the earnest prayer of
Yours truly, &c.
Sept. 6th, 1849.

A False Report Contradicted.
The *Wesleyan Times* has published, in various forms, during the past six or seven weeks, a report affecting the honest management of the Mission-Fund. At length, several names of respected Brethren were given in connection with the report, who have taken the opportunity of giving to it the indignant denial which it merited. The following are the Extracts from the Correspondence.—

Wesleyan Mission House, Bishopsgate-Str
Within London, 1st Sept., 1849.

MY DEAR SIR,—I have seen, for the first time, this afternoon, a paragraph in the *Wesleyan Times*, dated Aug. 27, page 572, to this effect:—“We have heard that the Rev. J. Walton, lately one of the Jamaica Missionaries, was intrusted with the memorial from certain Wesleyan Missionaries, complaining that the Annual Reports of the Society of the Jamaica District, did not agree, nor could they make them agree, with their own accounts, to the tune we have heard, of some thousands of pounds.” It is reported that Dr Bunting said in Conference, that the apparent discrepancy could be accounted for, and would be, in time. A Committee, it is said, is appointed to look into the case. Can the Rev. Mr. Inglis, or Rev. Mr. Blackwell, both of whom have recently returned from Jamaica, throw any light upon this mysterious affair?”

Will you be kind enough, by return of post, or at your early convenience to let me

have any comments you may wish to make on this paragraph, as the Committee is about to meet, and may justly expect from you any information you may have in your power to give.

I am, very truly, yours,
ELIJAH HOOLE.

- Rev. J. Walton.
- R. Inglis.
- J. Blackwell.
- H. Bleby.
- E. Lockyer.

TO THE REV. ELIJAH HOOLE,
Cochinford, Essex.
4th Sept., 1849.

MY DEAR SIR,—Your letter has within the last half hour reached me from Ryde, from whence it has been forwarded here. The paragraph to which you direct my attention in the *Wesleyan Times*, is among the lying wonders of the day.

The *Wesleyan Missionaries* in Jamaica never intrusted me with "a memorial" to the Committee—or to the Conference, on the subject to which that paragraph refers, or on any other subject whatever.

Since my return to England, I have received many letters from Jamaica, but there has not been the slightest reference to such a subject; and I believe there is not a Brother in Jamaica, either Missionary or Layman, who has not, with myself, the fullest confidence in the financial operations of the Committee.

I am, dear Sir, yours faithfully,
JAMES WALTON.

P.S. You are at liberty to make what use of this you please.

It will always give me pleasure to give any information on this, or any other subject within my power.

J. W.
York, 4th Sept., 1849.

REV. AND DEAR SIR,—Your favour of the 1st inst. did not reach me till last evening—too late to answer by return. As the *Wesleyan Times* has rarely come in my way, I feel greatly obliged by your furnishing me with a paragraph which it was of some importance I should be acquainted with, but which, only for your kind consideration, I might never have seen. I regard the introduction of my name to that paragraph as a most unwarrantable liberty—a deep personal injury and dishonour. But more and worse than this—it is a most unscrupulous mode of seeking to identify returned Missionaries with an *Anti-Missionary* Movement; and a wicked endeavour to give a show of truth, to what I am satisfied is a vile, and entirely unfounded, fabrication.

You ask for information for the Committee. In brief, then, let me say—that, at an early stage of the last Conference, I was informed by a reader of the *Wesleyan Times* in Leeds—(a personal friend, but not a member)—that "a deputation of laymen" had arrived from Jamaica to demand an explanation of some alleged discrepancy between the Annual Report and the District Accounts, as the paragraph in question describes. I at once expressed a conviction founded on my knowledge of Jamaica Affairs, and the care with which the Mission house accounts are kept—that there was no such discrepancy, and no such deputation. The next morning I was in Conference, and to place the matter beyond question I made inquiry respecting it of the brethren most recently returned. None of them knew anything of it. And, writing immediately afterwards to Mrs. Inglis, I requested her to tell my informant, that there was not a word of truth in this most unrighteous and damaging report.

Though I have no wish to figure in any newspaper, particularly in one which has made so free with public and private character, as the *Wesleyan Times*—yet as it has taken the liberty to call me out,—I shall not for a moment hesitate—if you approve—to give it such satisfaction as the truth plainly spoken, can give. Meanwhile waiting to know what steps you deem it best to take—and desiring respectful regards to Drs. Bunting, Burcham, and Alder.

I remain, Reverend and Dear Sir,
Most truly yours,
ROBERT INGLIS.

Rev. Elijah Hoole, &c. &c.

Extract of a letter from the Rev. John Blackwell, dated Horncastle, Sept. 4, 1849:

"I had not seen the *Wesleyan Times*, I never do see it, nor have I to the best of my knowledge conversed with, or written to, any person having aught to do with that mischievous organ. I have, and always had, the greatest abhorrence of its principles and influence. I never was in Jamaica, nor have any correspondent there, and therefore I know nothing of the Committee's accounts with that District.

Hence, whatever I have said to my friends, in confidence, on this subject, was not from personal observation, nor from direct communication, but what I had received from the verbal report of others."

Watlington, Sept. 6th, 1849.

REV. AND DEAR SIR,—I was out in my Circuit when your communication arrived, and did not return till late last evening, consequently I could not reply to it earlier.

I am very much astonished at the paragraph in the *Wesleyan Times*, to which you refer, as I am entirely ignorant of any Memorial, on any subject, having been intrusted to Mr. Walton, or of any Memorial on the subject mentioned there, having at any time been drawn up. How the Editor or Editors of the *Wesleyan Times* could have "heard" of such a thing, when I, who have so recently returned from Jamaica, am ignorant of it, I cannot tell. I have frequently seen Mr. Walton since my return—but never "heard" him say anything about it; and my firm belief is, that the "heard" of Memorial has in reality no existence, or I should certainly have "heard" of it. Indeed, I am utterly at a loss to know on what foundation the report can rest.

I am, Rev. and Dear Sir, your very truly,
EDMUND LOCKYER.

The Rev. Elijah Hoole.

TO THE REV. ELIJAH HOOLE.

REV. AND DEAR SIR,—Concerning the paragraph you have copied from the *Wesleyan Times* for my information, I would remark:

That Mr. Walton left Jamaica not more than five or six weeks later than myself, and arrived in England before me. We were both of us at the Annual District Meeting, held a short time before we embarked for this country, when the whole of the financial affairs of the District passed under review and inspection; but I never heard of any such Memorial as that referred to, up to the time that I came away from the Island, nor the slightest allusion to any discrepancy between the alleged and the real expenditure of the Mission. Such a subject was never referred to, either directly or indirectly, during the District Meeting; and I believe the whole statement to be a fabrication of the *Wesleyan Times*, as injurious to the Jamaica Missionaries as to the Missionary Committee.

For seven years I filled the office of Financial Secretary, or District Treasurer, in Jamaica, receiving and expending all the sums that were drawn from the General Fund for the support of the Mission; and had, therefore, the most perfect knowledge of its financial affairs. The idea of anything like discrepancy between the report and my own accounts,—for if any such discrepancy had existed at all, it must have been between the reports and my general cash accounts,—never once occurred to my mind; and I was astonished not a little when I saw the subject referred to in the *Wesleyan Times*. It was entirely new to me; for knowing as I did the extraordinary expenditure of the District, over and above the grant for the ordinary deficiencies, there was no room left in my mind for the thought that anything could possibly be wrong. And if any of the Jamaica brethren had had any idea that such a discrepancy existed I should certainly have known it, as my office necessarily involved me in financial transactions with it a whole of them, and frequent correspondence on financial matters. Besides, it could only be by referring to my general cash accounts from year to year and comparing them with the published report, that any of the Missionaries could satisfy themselves as to whether or not any discrepancy existed; and the book containing these accounts was in my possession continually, though accessible to any of the preachers who might wish to consult it. But never was any application made to me for the purpose of consulting the accounts, nor did I ever hear any brother express a doubt upon the subject.

The whole affair, I am persuaded, a foul and malicious attempt on the part of the *Wesleyan Times* to reflect injury upon our Missions and upon those to whom the management and direction of them are entrusted. I cheerfully acknowledge the right the Committee has to any information it may be in my power to give; and I shall be prompt to meet their wishes on this subject. I do not like to trust my own judgment in the matter; but if it should be considered advisable that any testimony I can give should be made public, to refute the slanderous insinuations contained in the paragraph you have quoted, I shall be quite ready to do anything that is in my power, as well for the sake of truth and justice, as to testify my abhorrence of the system of secret slander and wickedness of which the *Wesleyan Times* is the organ and abettor.

I am, Rev. and Dear Sir,

Very truly, and respectfully yours,
HENRY BLIZBY.

The Friends of the Wesleyan Missionary Society will now know what credit is to be attached to this report or any other report which may appear in an organ which has shown itself as reckless of the interests of the greatest charity in Methodism, as it is of personal character.—*Watkinson.*

From the Toronto Christian Guardian, C.W.

The main ground on which the Conference will stand justified in the eyes of all reflecting persons, is, that by the law of the Body, every Minister is bound to answer questions proposed by the Conference. He enters the Connexion knowing the power of the Conference to interrogate him and the obligation he is under to answer, and if he enter the body he is bound to reply to the questions of the Conference, or must be prepared to suffer the consequence of his contumacy. It is well that such a law exists. If it did not, it would not perhaps be very easy to punish a member whose conduct seriously injured the Connexion, but against whom direct evidence could not be brought.—It were seriously to be deprecated that an offender had the power to persist in his wrong-doing with perfect impunity because of legal technicalities and quibbles.

The President was correct when he said the Conference should not be defeated in doing right by mere technicalities. Many an offender at the bar of justice thus escapes; and in the same way is many an Act of Parliament defeated. O'Connell said there never was an Act of Parliament framed through which he could not drive a coach and six. We recollect reading of an Act which levied a duty upon black cattle—the usual designation for cattle in general. A witty drover escaped the duty by carefully purchasing and bringing into England cattle of all colours but black. Immediately an Act was passed to correct the error, and the term *burned* cattle was used instead of *black* cattle. These Legislators settled the question; but the same drover again defeated the design of the law by bringing in a drove of mooleys—cattle without horns.

The law of England we know holds every man innocent till he is proved guilty; and does not require him to criminate himself; but the law of the Conference requires its members to say whether they are guilty or not, if the Conference deem it necessary to propose the enquiry. In the cases of Messrs. Everitt, Dunn, and Griffith, the Conference insisted upon an explicit answer to a direct question touching the authorship of certain incendiary publications. The answer was withheld, and the penalty followed. While we regret, deeply regret, the cause of the action, we regard the action of the Conference a most righteous one. Sympathy for the offenders—not for the offence—would prompt us to wish for clemency in their case; but sympathy for others—sympathy for Methodists in England, in Ireland, in America, in every part of the world, compels us—as it must every right-minded Wesleyan—to demand the punishment of offenders against the peace, the spirit, the usage, and even the written law of Methodism.

Religious Items.

The Bible in Greece.—A singular work has recently commenced among the priests and laity of the Greek church in Zante, one of the Ionian Isles. By the study of the Bible, to which they have free access, the island being under British protection, a number of them have been led to abandon the Greek church; and they have applied to the Free church of Scotland for a minister to preach to them.

Defeat of the Anti-Sabbatarians.—A signal defeat has been obtained by the friends of religion in their late difficulties with the Scottish railroad companies, many of whom have hitherto persevered in running their trains on the Sabbath.

General Baptists.—The General Baptists of England recently held their anniversaries at Leicester. The meetings were well attended, and of an interesting nature. The churches share largely in the Christian activity of the age, and enjoy a good degree of prosperity. They report 100 regular ministers, 17,500 members, 1000 baptized during the last year, 22,000 Sunday School scholars, and 2,500 teachers.

Particular Baptists.—The Baptist Reporter for August gives the following summary of the present condition of the Baptists in Great Britain. Scotland is omitted in the general estimate. Churches, 1,804; members, 128,087; net increase for the year, 4,132; Sunday School scholars, 144,735.

Death of the Bishop of Norwich.—The Right Rev. Edward Stanley, D. D. Bishop of Norwich, expired on the 6th inst. at Bruhan Castle, near Dingwall, after a short illness which terminated in fatal congestion of the brain. Deceased was son of Sir T. J. Stanley, Bart., and was born in 1772.