

On the following Lord's day I felt that I could no longer delay admitting the *Karheri* Christian natives to the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. They had been candidates for many months, but I had deferred their admission from time to time, that I might be satisfied as to their walking consistently since their baptism. I, as well as their employers, had every reason to be satisfied with their conduct; and every cause to believe that they are Christians in heart and affection, as well as in profession. Previously to admitting them I delivered an address on the subject and nature of the ordinance, to which they all listened with breathless attention.

In the next fact which I shall mention, it will be seen that the celebration of one of our beautiful services was interrupted in a slight degree by the rudeness of the natives. On the morning of the 19th Oct. 1830, I married my lad *Pahau* to *Rea*, a young female from the Pa of the *Ngai-te-ake*: the wedding was well furnished with guests; upwards of 300 strangers were present, and three or four times that number were outside the chapel, unable to gain admittance: all of them were feasted on the occasion. There was a little opposition to the wedding; but not till it was over, as is always the custom here. The bride's mother came to me, the preceding afternoon, and said she was well pleased in her heart that her daughter was going to be married to *Pahau*; but that she must be angry about it with her mouth in the presence of her tribe, lest the natives should come and take away all her possessions, and destroy her crops. This is customary upon all great occasions: if a chief meets with an accident, he is stripped as a mark of respect; if he marries a wife, he has to lose all his property; and this is done out of respect, not from disrespect, as it was once printed inadvertently in an official publication.

A chief would think himself slighted if his food and garments were not taken away from him upon many occasions. To prevent this, *Mauga*, the old mother, acted with policy. As I was returning therefore from church with the bride and bridegroom, she met the procession, and began to assail us all furiously. She put on a most terrific countenance, threw her garments about, and tore her hair like a fury; then said to me, "Ah! you white missionary, you are worse than the devil; you first make a slave of your son by redeeming him from his master, and then you marry him to my daughter, who is a lady! I will tear your eyes out! I will tear your eyes out!" The old woman, suiting the action to the word, feigned a scratch at my face; at the same time saying to me in an under tone, that it was "all mouth," and that she did not mean what she said. I told her I should stop her mouth with a blanket. "Ha! ha! ha!" she replied, "that is all I wanted. I only wanted to get a blanket, and therefore I made all this noise." The whole affair after this went off remarkably well; all seemed to enjoy themselves, and every one was satisfied.

As illustrative of the influence of our public religious services, I will only add the following account of an occasion much to be remembered by our missionary friends, for the signal instance of the Divine favour in averting the horrors of war:—

On the 8th August 1832, two sermons were preached to the Europeans, and two to the natives; the day having been set apart for the purpose of returning thanks to Almighty God for His great mercy, in bringing back the *Ngai-pu-hi* in safety, without permitting them to effect their bloody purposes with respect to *Tauranga*. Many of the people who headed this expedition were present; and after the conclusion of the service, they said that they had all along attributed it to our prayers, and to the interference of our God, that they had not been able to effect any thing! they said, they felt themselves unnerved and unmanned; and their hearts, instead of swelling with bravery, turned round, jumped up, and sank down with fear!

It was a strange sight to behold the very persons who had been disappointed, listening to us, whilst returning thanks to God, in their own language, for having frustrated their purposes!

THE CHURCH.

COBOURG, SATURDAY, MARCH 28, 1840.

In concluding, last week, our report of "Perceval's Apology for the Apostolical Succession," we intended to have offered some accompanying remarks of our own, requesting the attention of our readers to the whole argument as thus ably and briefly set forth. This little work is a tribute, amongst many others which the "signs of the times" have called forth, from an able and devoted son of the Church in support of primitive truth and order, and to aid and direct the spirit of inquiry which, upon the important subject which the work itself embraces, is now abroad. Annexed to the work are several valuable Appendices; some of which we may hereafter transfer to our pages.

It must strike the reflecting Christian as somewhat strange that the principle for the maintenance of authority and the exercise of office within assigned and legitimate bounds, which is so positively recognized and so universally acted upon in the mere business of life, should, in so many cases, be wholly overlooked or utterly set at naught in the instance of the ministry of the Church. In the case of the administration of the civil laws of the country, individuals are not permitted, according to their mere discretion, to exercise the functions which pertain to them; but rules are laid down which must, in all cases, be adhered to, and without an obedience to which, we should, in attempting the discharge of those functions, be liable to pains and penalties. It may happen that the administrators of the laws are, in a given instance, unfaithful or incompetent, and that individuals exist in the community far better qualified, by moral principle and legal attainments, to fulfil their duties;—to redress individual wrongs and promote the general good,—but no person, however philanthropic, is permitted to undertake the discharge of those duties without subjecting himself to the established ordeal, and obtaining his authority from the legitimate and recognized source.

The case of the medical department is similar. An individual may, from taste or benevolence, enter upon the study of and acquire a knowledge of medicine or surgery; but to exercise his skill—however pressing may be the need of his gratuitous and irregular services—without the usual authority, so far from procuring for him the gratitude of the community, will expose him to the penalty of the violated laws. If, in that department, he would be useful to his generation, he must receive his license from the quarter which the laws appoint; else, whatever may be his qualifications, he is legally incapacitated from the discharge of its duties.

We shall assume another parallel case. A British subject may be residing amongst a foreign people, and he may by possibility observe the honour of his Sovereign and the welfare of his country compromised by an unfaithful or incompetent ambassador. He may understand the true interests of his native land far better than the individual to whom the protection of those interests has been entrusted; but no act of his, without the formal sanction of his King, without a positive delegation of power, could be valid for the assertion of the violated dignity of his Sovereign or of the outraged honour and advantage of his country. All his loyalty, be it ever so fervent—his patriotism, however pure, will avail not, unattended by a commission to act in his Sovereign's name—without credentials which all can recognize as valid and undoubted.

It is strange, we repeat, that the principle which is so scrupulously adhered to in the exercise of mere worldly trusts, should be set aside and utterly disregarded in the performance of duties which concern the everlasting interests of men. In the cases we have adduced, restrictions are imposed and regulations for the assumption and discharge of particular duties are laid down, in order to guard against irregularities,—to prevent the intrusion

into such offices of incompetent persons,—to avoid the mischiefs which to the persons and estates of men would result from an indiscriminate permission to all, to undertake the discharge of those duties. It cannot but be admitted that, as a general rule, the same necessity exists for a settled standard of admission to its offices, in the case of the Christian ministry. For the exclusion of false teachers and the preservation of the truth, a similar rule—on every admitted principle of human prudence and wisdom—should be laid down. There should be an established and recognized depository of the power to convey the ministerial commission,—any assumption of which, unless so derived, should be regarded as irregular, unlawful and sinful.

Carelessly and complacently as many Christians, in the present times, may view these irregularities, we find from an appeal to the Word of God that a rule was laid down for the government of the Church, which would, if faithfully adhered to, entirely prevent an unauthorized and irresponsible assumption of the ministerial commission. The congregation of Israel, for example, were not allowed to frame their own rules in regard to the priesthood; but the manner of appointment and the mode of succession was specially revealed by Almighty God himself. That no intrusion into the office, as settled by the Divine command, was to be allowed, is sufficiently evident from the result of the attempt made by Korah, Dathan, and Abiram to introduce an innovation. The same principle was strictly acted upon, when the Old covenant was superseded by and merged into the New; for to suppose that this principle was set at naught or abrogated by the New dispensation, would be to assert, contrary to our Saviour's express declaration, that the Law had "passed away" and had not been "fulfilled."

But we need not dwell upon the details of an argument which, in a short compass, is so ably sustained in the work to which, in the commencement of this article, we have alluded. It is evident, beyond the power of contradiction, that in the Christian Church a rule was laid down for the appointment and the perpetuation of "ambassadors of Christ" and "stewards of the mysteries of God;" and that, in scarce a solitary instance, do we find that rule departed from for the first 1500 years of its history.

In the question of Episcopacy is necessarily involved the doctrine, against which so many of the wayward, the thoughtless and the ignorant are directing their "railing accusations,"—the doctrine of the "Apostolical Succession." We may be pleased and edified by the contemplation of a Church, built upon the Apostolical model—with its triple priesthood of Bishops, Priests and Deacons,—but if we discover that this Church is defective in the derivation of the authority upon which its Ministry acts, the beauty and the comfort of the picture vanishes at once. We must be sure that the individual, or the individuals, who exercise the office of a Bishop in the Church of God, have derived their authority from those who were duly commissioned to impart it, or their authority goes for naught: it is not apostolically, not divinely conferred; and is, therefore, nothing more or less than an usurpation. And in regarding the derivation of this commission, the doctrine of a "Succession" is, we repeat, necessarily involved: if we abandon that belief, we abandon the only test for ascertaining the validity of the commission. The power of any Bishop who now lays hands upon another, must be falsely derived and improperly exercised, which has not proceeded in a continuous line from the very days of the Apostles. If, in some churches, this continuous line cannot be traced up, link by link to the Apostles' days, there are multitudes of churches—with the Episcopal government—in which it can be so traced. In almost every diocese in England and Ireland, that chain of succession can be adduced, in a manner as clear and undoubted as the line of descent of any of the Sovereigns of Europe. But supposing that from the loss of records, or other causes, it could not be so traced: the opponents of the principle, in order to destroy its validity and support their own position, would be obliged to point out the time at which such a succession can be demonstrated to have stopped. In no instance, touching the National Church of England or Ireland, can such a break in the line of succession be pointed out; so that, even if no record of its continuity existed, the presumption would be that it never was broken.—Should any body of Christians upon earth, who build their ecclesiastical structure upon the Presbyterian model, be able to point to a line of presbyters who exercised the power of ordination since the Apostles' days, or even if it could be so far traced up that it was lost in the uncertainty of distant time, the features of the case, as respects them, would be materially changed. We should be bound to give credit to antecedent probability, where we could advance nothing in positive disproof. But it is not possible to adduce a single instance of that form of government, in which the exercise of the power to confer the ministerial commission will not, when traced up, stop with an individual or individuals who never received the authority to confer that commission, but whose power in the ministry was limited to that of preaching the Word of God and administering the Sacraments. The line of their succession will be found to terminate with those who never received authority to "lay hands" upon others; and consequently their assumption of that authority, in whatsoever instance made, cannot but be deemed irregular, unlawful, and an usurpation.

It were enough, we contend, to assume this position touching the Ministry, simply because we have not in the Word of God the shadow of a justification for departing from the constitution of the Church as originally established, and because the Scriptures are full of warnings against such a departure from specific ordinances and divine appointments. But we have a practical inducement for dwelling upon this feature of the case,—as the question in which is mainly involved the restoration of CHRISTIAN UNITY. The various theories promulgated for the accomplishment of this happy and glorious end, separate from the restoration of one uniform government and discipline, will end in vanity because based in error. There cannot be a union of Churches or of Christians, until the original platform of the Church, as constituted by Christ and his Apostles, be universally restored,—until, as in the primitive days, all "continue steadfastly in the apostles' doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread, and in prayers." That, it is our humble persuasion, is the only bond of union; and this restored, we should, in looking round upon the churches of Christendom, discern them in general features, in one grand cementing principle the same.

Nec diversa tamen; qualem esse decet sororum,—with the same visible and recognized mark of sisterhood; resting for their spiritual vitality upon the same Lord,—upon Him who of the holy and imperishable fabric is the "chief corner-stone."

We ventured, two or three weeks ago, to express our doubts as to the accuracy of the statements given by the Editor of the *Christian Guardian*, in accounting for the secession from the Methodist ministry of several individuals to whom we then alluded. We hazarded this doubt, as well from the manifestation, on more than one occasion, of very serious inaccuracies of statement on the part of that editor,—cases in which the denial or refutation offered by ourselves was received, as was becoming, with the respect of silence,—as from a belief that

the individuals in question were entitled to quite as much respect, until guilt was proven, as the editor of the *Guardian* himself. And in expressing our doubt of the exact truth of his assertions touching those individuals, we felt very sure that explanations would be offered which would support us in our opinion that the allegations brought forward by the *Guardian* were made rather from a spirit of personal dissatisfaction, than from any sudden concern or anxiety for the purity of the Church into which they have been admitted, or for whose ministry they are preparing. According to this anticipation, we are furnished already with a very satisfactory refutation of those charges in the first and third out of the four instances adduced by him, as well as with a few remarks on another cited case where his editorial honesty and ingenuousness do not stand out in any new or brighter relief. The individual alluded to under the second head, will perhaps not feel it necessary to notice an attack in which no moral delinquency is involved: the fourth person assailed is, we have reason to believe, preparing a full refutation. But that our readers may properly understand the nature of the charges made against those individuals respectively, we shall place before them the exact words of the *Guardian*:—

"1. In the first case, the individual had been a Roman Catholic from his birth up to manhood; he then left the Church of Rome, and joined the 'Canadian Wesleyans,' and became a Preacher amongst them; about four years afterwards, he expressed to the writer of these remarks very conscientious scruples as to the scriptural character of the polity of the body to which he belonged, and made very earnest application to be received into the Conference of the Wesleyan Methodist Church; he was at length received a year on trial, and subsequently admitted; about four years afterwards he became scrupulous as to the polity of the Wesleyan Methodist Church; got his year's salary paid in advance, to meet an asserted exigency, and within a week seceded; leaving the body under such circumstances, in several respects, as to induce the District Meeting, and afterwards the Conference, to which he was a member, to record upon their Journals (although we withheld it from the columns of the *Guardian*) that he had withdrawn 'under very dishonourable circumstances.'"

"2. In regard to the second case, the individual, a few months before his secession, addressed a communication to the Editor of the *Guardian* for publication, the object and burden of which was, to prove that the Methodists were as much bound in duty to separate from the Church of England on account of its corruptions, as the Church of England was bound to separate from the Church of Rome at the period of Reformation. His position was so extreme, and his statements and allusions so offensive, that we declined publishing it; in consequence of which a difference took place between the author and us, that resulted in his writing against us, and in favor of the Church of England, and ultimately, after having received disciplinary censure for his conduct, to his seceding from the Methodist Church. His anti-church communication is, however, still in our office. We are happy to be able to add, that the individual here referred to, has, as far as we know, conducted himself in an inoffensive manner since his secession."

"3. In regard to the third case, the individual had contracted debts to various individuals, and at the Methodist Book Room to the amount of more than £60, without paying a farthing; and we declined publishing it; in consequence of which a difference took place between the author and us, that resulted in his writing against us, and in favor of the Church of England, and ultimately, after having received disciplinary censure for his conduct, to his seceding from the Methodist Church. His anti-church communication is, however, still in our office. We are happy to be able to add, that the individual here referred to, has, as far as we know, conducted himself in an inoffensive manner since his secession."

"4. In regard to the fourth case, a few months before the secession took place, the individual addressed us a communication (which is still in our possession) against the Church of England, so harsh and virulent that we withheld it from our readers; subsequently circumstances transpired relative to a matrimonial engagement which required the prompt and decided interposition of the authorities of the Church. Application and admission as a candidate for orders in the Church of England ensued in a few days."

COMMUNICATIONS.

To the Editor of the Church.

Barton, March 16, 1840.

SIR:—This is the first time in which I have had occasion to trespass upon the columns of your paper; and I hope it may be the last upon such subject at least as the present.

In the *Christian Guardian* of the 4th inst., under the head of "Secession of Ministers from the Methodist Church to the Church of England," the editor charges me with having "got a year's salary paid in advance to meet an asserted exigency, and within a week seceded;"—evidently with the intention to leave the impression on the public mind that this was the reason why I left the Methodist body.

I know not how far this statement may have been circulated already to my injury, secretly; but I am glad that I have now an opportunity of meeting it publicly, and of giving my reasons, in few words, for withdrawing from that Society. In the first place, with respect to my receiving "a year's salary in advance," the editor of the *Guardian* must be aware that such a thing has scarcely, if ever, occurred in the annals of Methodism, that a Preacher should receive his year's salary in advance. In the next place he must also be aware that I remained in Cornwall nearly three quarters of a year, as Missionary in that place, before leaving "or seceding" from the connexion. If I received my year's salary within one week of my "secession," then I must have been more than eight months without enjoying any part of it. This is receiving "a year's salary in advance."

The circumstances of the case are as follows:—At the Conference held in Kingston in June 1838, I was appointed as Missionary to Cornwall. The first money I received was £10, which merely paid my travelling expenses. The Preachers are always allowed these expenses in addition to their salary; and it is generally the first thing paid. Instead of receiving my quarter's salary when due, I did not receive a farthing of it for four months, and then only £5. Mr. Stinson, from whom I received my stipend (and who was always kind), apologized for not sending it sooner, and the full amount. About six weeks after this, I received a letter from Mr. Stinson, stating that he had paid a person in Toronto, a Mr. P—, something more than £20 for me, and requested me in the same letter to draw upon him for a further sum of £25, which I did. The next payment I received was in the latter end of January 1839, when Mr. Stinson was at my residence, which left me then something in his debt,—not more, however, than a few pounds; and at all events not sufficient to meet the remainder of my year's salary. A short time after this I took my leave of Methodism.

But the following letters addressed to the same Reverend Joseph Stinson, President of the Conference and Superintendent of Wesleyan Missions in Upper Canada, to which I have never received any reply, will show what were my reasons for leaving that society; and the christian public can judge how far Mr. Ryerson was justifiable in making the assertion that I received "a year's salary in advance, and within a week seceded."

Brockville, March 8th, 1839.

My dear Sir,—I have received yours of the 25th ultimo, forwarded to this place, and I now avail myself of the opportunity of answering it, to state my views more fully on the step I have taken. But before entering upon this point, allow me to say that up to the very night in which I took my departure from the congregation in Cornwall, I have neither said or done any thing prejudicial to the interests of Wesleyan Methodism, as my own conscience (to which you refer me) and the congregation there will fully testify; but on the contrary I have tried, to the utmost of my power, to further its interest in every way. Allow me also to say, that there is not an individual in the Conference against whom I have the slightest ill-will, but love them as I always did. I have not, as you are aware, approved of the course the Editor of the *Guardian* has taken,—I mean as to the manner of his conducting the paper.

My mind has undergone no change whatever with respect to the doctrines of the Methodist Society, as I always understood and believed them to be in accordance with those of the Church. I could not of course complain of the manner in which you had paid my salary, as you paid even more than it amounted to.—The question may be asked then, what caused me to take the step I did. It was simply this. Sometime last summer, I heard a sermon delivered by the Rev. Mr. Archbold, on the subject of schism, which at first greatly displeased me, as I thought it was partly levelled at me, and at the Methodist society. However, in the course of time, it caused me to think upon the subject, and upon that of ordination; and from my own reasoning, and some little I read at the time, I came to the conclusion that there must

be a valid ordination in order to a right and correct call to the ministry. I felt I had not that; and that it was only to be found among those who had the Apostolic Succession,—which I now believe the Church has.

At the time when you were at my place, my mind was in some trouble on this point, but I thought that before Conference it might wear away. If not, I would state my views and request to be dropped. This was the reason of my not acquiescing you on the matter at the time; viz., my mind not being fully made up on the subject. However, I became more and more troubled, until I came to the conclusion that an Episcopal Ordination was absolutely necessary. The very day I came to this conclusion I wrote to you; and having but one sheet of paper in the house, I wrote on half of it to you, and on half to the Chairman of the District, acquainting you both with my determination.

My mind having undergone this change, I thought it would be sinful in me to continue preaching until Conference; besides it would be at the expense of the Missionary Society. You must consider I did not leave a Society destitute, for there was none,—though I tried several times to form a class, and did even the very week previous to your visiting us. I wrote to the preacher next me, requesting him to supply the appointment if he could. However, let me try to vindicate myself as I may. I know that you and the Brethren will think hard of me; but I have not left you out of ill-will, and I hope I shall never become an enemy. I would wish, if it were consistent, not to have my name on the minutes as withdrawn, but as dropt.

I am, &c.

J. FLANAGAN.

Rev. Joseph Stinson, President of the Wesleyan Methodist Conference in Canada.

Brockville, May 21st, 1839.

My dear Sir:—I have been expecting a letter from you every day for the last two months. In my last, in answer to yours of the 25th of February, I furnished you with the information you required respecting my travelling expenses, house-rent, &c. &c., and the cause of the step I had taken. I have had by me since that time money wholly for the purpose of repaying you what I had received over my due. I expected you would have answered me immediately and mention the sum I was owing you, or the committee; and therefore prepared myself to meet it at that time. You would do me a favour by letting me know what I have received over my salary, so that I may send it to you; for I find it no easy matter to keep money, especially when there are a number of wants. You, doubtless, remember that I some time ago sent a blank note to Mr. P—, of Toronto, to be thrown into the bank in that place, for the sum of twenty-five pounds currency, and requested you to become one of the indorsers; but you, preferring to pay the amount of my account with Mr. P., did not let the note be thrown in, but took it yourself. You will have the kindness to transmit me that blank note lest it should fall into the hands of some person that might do mischief with it. If the note is destroyed, of course I cannot expect it; your word for this will be sufficient, otherwise I will expect it previous to my paying you any thing. I have not heard a word about you or the Society since I have been here. I have given up taking any of the Provincial papers, lest they should interfere with my studies, which is the reason I have heard nothing how you are getting along. Still I would be glad to hear of you, and Mr. Harvard, and of your individual prospects. But it is still my impression that neither yourself, or any real Wesleyan Methodist, will be happy or comfortable with the Canadian Brethren. Surely you must confess that the *Guardian* has been a curse to the Society, and to the cause of religion, since it came into the hands of its last Editor; but I have not seen it since I left Cornwall, with the exception of once that I barely saw the paper, and it may have greatly improved. While the Conference continue to be of Mr. Ryerson's way of thinking, I think the cause of true Wesleyanism will suffer. I have been anxious to hear whether Mr. Alder is expected out for your next Conference; surely if he comes, he will put a veto on every thing like radicalism in the Conference. But it is not likely he will come. It remains for you then to gain the good-will of all who really love your Wesleyanism, by taking a decided stand against such sentiments as have been promulgated by the *Guardian*, since it came into the hands of its present Editor.

I am happy in the step I have taken, as I have the Ministry still in view. I still believe a valid ordination necessary to a right call to the Ministry, and that this ordination can come only through a regular Episcopacy.

Remember me kindly to Mr. Harvard (if he is at Conference), Mr. Evans—both Mr. Evans's. Tell Mr. Harvard that the notice that came to me of his intention of being in Cornwall on such a night, did not reach me until the Monday after the appointment was to have been given out, and that I rode 52 miles the day he was expected there in order to see him; but he had left in the stage about half an hour before I got home. I regretted I had not seen him. I have no doubt but my name will be treated with a cruel and barbarous severity by some in the Conference, but I care not; for Mr. Harvard, Mr. E. and Mr. Evans, and yourself, and all that are really and truly Wesleyan, I hope to entertain a kindly feeling while I live. I would say, remember me to Mr. and Mrs. S. of Toronto, &c.

J. FLANAGAN.

Rev. Joseph Stinson, President of the Wesleyan Conference of U. Canada.

Let the above letters supply their own comment. I have now only one or two remarks more to make. One is respecting the two other instances of "secession," mentioned by Mr. Ryerson, "which have occurred of late years," in addition to the four which have taken place within the last twelve months.

It is true the Editor of the *Guardian* does not state whether they occurred in this or in another country; the object, however, is the same,—to injure the Church in this Province. There was a young man who came to this country a few years ago from the United States, who had received a classical education, and who "travelled a number of months as an itinerant Preacher, under the direction of a Chairman of a District;" but instead of "being sent home for the want of being competent," he became convinced of the invalidity of Methodistic ordination,—went home—[that is, to the United States],—studied for the Church—was received as a Candidate for Holy Orders, by one of the Bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church,—was ordained, and is now a Missionary in one of the Western States! His name is to be found in the Churchman's Almanac for 1840.

The "other instance,"—if it be the one alluded to,—was a young man from Kingston, of whose "talents and qualifications" Mr. Ryerson had a right to know something, as he was most popular in that town,—perhaps as much so as any preacher they ever had in it; and Mr. Ryerson, the Editor of the *Guardian*, has been stationed there. He was sent as a Missionary to the Lower Province, and though still "a candidate as a four years' probationer," left the Methodist Society, joined the Church, studied for her Ministry, was admitted as a candidate for Orders, was subsequently ordained, and is now stationed in that Province.

These may not be the "two other instances" alluded to by Mr. R. If they are not, he will please correct me; but if they are, how strangely has he represented their cases! The two young men are at a distance, and may never have an opportunity of seeing the *Guardian*; otherwise, I should not have noticed the accusation against them.

I must next remark upon what Mr. Ryerson says about their Preachers' salaries. "In the Methodist Ministry," says he, "no man is allowed more than the limited salary stated in the discipline of the church." Mr. R. has forgotten to mention what that salary is: the object of the remark is to convey the idea that their allowance is very small, and this their people are taught to believe; while it is carefully stated that others—Clergymen of the Church particularly—are allowed enormous salaries; and that the reason why men are "induced to change their ecclesiastical relations," or to leave the Methodists and join the Church, is because they can better their temporal circumstances. It is true Mr. R. has endeavoured to soften the force of this expression by saying, "he does not wish to be understood to apply these remarks to any one who might, from a sense of duty, irrespective of any worldly or selfish considerations, be induced to change;" yet he does not apply this latter remark to any of the "four" or six cases already alluded to,—as if they did not act from such disinterested motives!

I am far from thinking that Methodist Ministers get too much, or even enough to support them; yet I think it unfair to represent their situations so near akin to beggary, while Clergymen of the Church are said to have so much. Mr. Ryerson has referred us to the discipline, without stating what the discipline says. He is well aware that not one Churchman in a hundred, or perhaps in a thousand, possesses that discipline; and many of his own people do not understand it. But what does the discipline allow them? Under the head of "Temporal Economy," section 4, page 130, "Of the Allowance to Ministers and Preachers, and to their Wives, Widows, and Children,"—

"1. The Annual Allowance of the Travelling Preachers shall be one hundred dollars, and their travelling expenses."

"2. The annual allowance of the wives of travelling Preachers shall be one hundred dollars."

"3. Each child of a travelling Preacher shall be allowed sixteen dollars annually, to the age of seven years; and twenty four dollars annually from the age of seven to fourteen years; and those preachers whose wives are dead shall be allowed for each child annually a sum sufficient to pay the board of such child or children, during the above term of years."

Then under section 5, page 136,—"It shall be the duty of the said Committee (mentioned on page 135), or one appointed for that purpose, who shall be members of our church, to make an estimate of the amount necessary to furnish fuel and table expenses (that is board) for the family or families of Preachers stationed with them, and the stewards shall provide, by such means as they may devise, to meet such expenses, in money or otherwise." They are also allowed for horse-keeping, which comes under the head of "travelling expenses."

Now to put the whole into form, the following may be considered the average salary of a married Preacher annually:—

Preacher's salary, - - - - -	£25 0 0
Wife's do. - - - - -	25 0 0
Travelling expenses one year with another, - - - - -	10 0 0
Allowing on an average 2 children to each Family, - - - - -	10 0 0
Table expenses [this item is regulated by the Committee according to the size of each family], on an average we may say, - - - - -	50 0 0
House rent, if there is no parsonage, about - - - - -	20 0 0
Fuel on an average, at least - - - - -	6 0 0
Keeping of Horse [I have not included this in travelling expenses], - - - - -	6 0 0
	£152 0 0

Besides the above, each Preacher, married or single, has an interest in the "Book Concern,"—that is, they are allowed so much per cent on all books they sell; then a discount on all they purchase for their own use. If they become supernumerary, or supernumerary, they are still supported; and when they die their widows and children are allowed a salary. All this I was aware of when I left the Society, during my continuance in which I was in the receipt of a married Preacher's salary. I know that as to temporal matters I could do as well, if not better, among the Methodists than in the Church. But I felt that I durst no longer preach, or administer the Sacraments, without being duly and properly ordained. And though I had been ordained as a Methodist Preacher, yet I could not cease from thinking and asking,—who ordained the man that ordained me; who gave him the authority? Was it a Conference of Preachers; and English Preachers too? Yes; the English Conference appointed him as President of the Conference in this Province,—perhaps set him apart by imposition of hands for the work. But who gave them the right to ordain? Trace it to its fountain,—was Mr. Wesley any thing more than a Presbyter in the Church? And when was it known that a Presbyter ordained previous to the introduction of dissent? In this way I became convinced that I had no right to preach, having never received Episcopal ordination. Besides, I wondered why it was that the Methodists in this country did away with two orders in their Ministry, when some years ago they had three!—Now they have but one, viz., that of "Minister." I reasoned in my own mind, had they a right to do so? could the Conference deliberately do away with the orders of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, and institute that of "Minister" in its stead? It is true they never had a valid Episcopacy, though they were called Episcopal Methodists, and had the three orders among them: still the doing away with two orders had the effect, together with other matters, of making me reflect upon the subject. And the consequence of my reflection was, that I came to the conviction with that of Ignatius, that "without BISHOPS, PRIESTS, and DEACONS, there is no Church." Hence the step that I have taken.—Even Mr. Wesley himself seems to have believed not only in the three orders of ministers, but also in the "Apostolical succession." The following letter written to Mr. Hall, who wished Mr. Wesley and his brother to leave the Church, will show in what light he viewed these subjects. "Having received a long letter from Mr. Hall, earnestly pressing my brother and me to renounce the Church of England (for not complying with which advice he soon renounced us), I wrote him as follows:—

"Dear Brother,

"Now you act the part of a friend. It has been long our desire that you would speak freely. And we will do the same. What we know not yet, may God reveal to us! You think first, that we undertake to defend some things, which are not defensible by the Word of God. You instance in three: on each of which we will explain ourselves as clearly as we can.

"1. That the validity of our Ministry depends on a succession supposed to be from the Apostles, and a commission derived from the Pope of Rome, and his successors or dependents."

"We believe it would not be right for us to administer either Baptism or the Lord's Supper, unless we had a commission so to do from those Bishops whom we apprehend to be in a succession from the Apostles. And yet we allow these Bishops are the successors of those who are dependent on the Bishop of Rome. But we would be glad to know 'on what reasons you believe this to be inconsistent with the Word of God?'

"That there is an outward priesthood, and consequently an outward sacrifice, ordained and offered by the Bishop of Rome, and his successors or dependents, in the Church of England, as Vicars and Vicegerents of Christ."

"We believe there is, and always was, in every Christian Church (whether dependent on the Bishop of Rome or not), an outward priesthood ordained by Jesus Christ, and an outward sacrifice offered therein by men authorized to act as ambassadors of Christ, and stewards of the mysteries of God.

"On what grounds do you believe that Christ has abolished that priesthood or sacrifice?"

"3. That this Papal Hierarchy and Prelacy which still continues in the Church of England, is of Apostolical institution, and authorized thereby, though used by the unworthy."

"We believe that the threefold order of Ministers (which you seem to mean by Papal Hierarchy and Prelacy), is not only authorized by its Apostolical institution, but also by the written word."—[Mr. Wesley's Works, Printed at the Conference Office, 14 City Road, by John Jones, Agent, London, 1809, Vol. 2nd, page 329.]

In answer to the above, it may be said that Mr. Wesley afterwards became convinced, by reading Lord King's account of the Primitive Church, that Bishops and Presbyters were one order.—In the same Vol., page 332, we have Mr. Wesley's own words on that point:—"Monday, 20. I set out for Bristol. On the road I read over Lord King's account of the Primitive Church. In spite of the vehement prejudice of my education, I was ready to believe that this was a fair and impartial draught. But if so, it would follow that Bishops and Presbyters are (essentially) of one order; and that originally every Christian congregation was a Church independent on all others." He does not here admit to be convinced that it was so. In conclusion I have only to say, that this is the first time I have published any thing that may appear to be against the *Guardian*, or its Editor, or the Methodists, since I left that connexion; nor would I now have taken up the pen, had not Mr. Ryerson in his "attack" upon my character necessarily compelled me.

I have the honour to be, Rev. Sir,

Your obedient Servant,

J. FLANAGAN.

To the Editor of the *Christian Guardian*.

Brockville, March 12th, 1840.

SIR:—Although I had remarked to an eminent minister in your body, about the time of my withdrawal from it, that I might expect much calumny and reproach on account of the step I was about to take, yet I must confess to have been surprised, when I heard that some gross and unprovoked misrepresentations, in regard to my secession from the Methodist body, had appeared in the *Guardian* of the 4th inst. Although my name had not been mentioned, yet having been the third who has withdrawn from the Wesleyans within the last twelve months, it appears very certain that I am the individual to whom you refer. Respecting those ungenerous insinuations, I beg to make the following observations.—In the first place you remark, "the individual had contracted debts to various individuals, and at the Methodist Book-