

—the *divine* law—which prohibits ministers and other members of the Church, and all who can conveniently attend, from meeting three times on the Sabbath and on the days of the week for seven or nine days in succession, to read and preach the Word, sing His praise, and offer prayers of blessing? If our friend can produce a law which will decide the case at once in his favour; but if he cannot produce it—and we cannot—then all his censures are wide mark, and for aught he has done, or can do, the lawfulness of protracted meetings does not stand.

According to our Cotemporary, the sin of meetings consists in ministers and people doing themselves more frequently than on any occasions, in the use of certain means he acknowledges to be right and proper means, in order to seek for a revival—may read and preach and sing and pray as possible twice a Sabbath, and once or twice on week-evenings, for a revival; but his more frequently is an unpardonable sin. Divested of all extraneous considerations, the matter comes to this:

Our Cotemporary proposes a plan of operation in the case of a Church or congregation evidently in a state of spiritual lethargy, is:

1. That the true Israel of that Church or Congregation pray more fervently.
2. That what is done at Protracted Meetings, is what is done at all times, in all places, in all seasons, in all circumstances.

3. That what is done at Protracted Meetings, is what is done at all times, in all places, in all seasons, in all circumstances.

4. That what is done at Protracted Meetings, is what is done at all times, in all places, in all seasons, in all circumstances.

5. That what is done at Protracted Meetings, is what is done at all times, in all places, in all seasons, in all circumstances.

6. That what is done at Protracted Meetings, is what is done at all times, in all places, in all seasons, in all circumstances.

7. That what is done at Protracted Meetings, is what is done at all times, in all places, in all seasons, in all circumstances.

8. That what is done at Protracted Meetings, is what is done at all times, in all places, in all seasons, in all circumstances.

9. That what is done at Protracted Meetings, is what is done at all times, in all places, in all seasons, in all circumstances.

10. That what is done at Protracted Meetings, is what is done at all times, in all places, in all seasons, in all circumstances.

11. That what is done at Protracted Meetings, is what is done at all times, in all places, in all seasons, in all circumstances.

12. That what is done at Protracted Meetings, is what is done at all times, in all places, in all seasons, in all circumstances.

13. That what is done at Protracted Meetings, is what is done at all times, in all places, in all seasons, in all circumstances.

14. That what is done at Protracted Meetings, is what is done at all times, in all places, in all seasons, in all circumstances.

15. That what is done at Protracted Meetings, is what is done at all times, in all places, in all seasons, in all circumstances.

16. That what is done at Protracted Meetings, is what is done at all times, in all places, in all seasons, in all circumstances.

17. That what is done at Protracted Meetings, is what is done at all times, in all places, in all seasons, in all circumstances.

18. That what is done at Protracted Meetings, is what is done at all times, in all places, in all seasons, in all circumstances.

19. That what is done at Protracted Meetings, is what is done at all times, in all places, in all seasons, in all circumstances.

20. That what is done at Protracted Meetings, is what is done at all times, in all places, in all seasons, in all circumstances.

thing that they shall ask, it shall be done for them, if it be the Father which is in heaven."

2. "Unwarranted by Scripture as well as by the whole history of well accredited Revivals."

Reason assigned—"For nowhere in Scripture or in the page of history do we read of Revivals taking place, save by the divine blessing attending the use of the *ordinary* means laid down in the Bible."

Answer—"We might grant this, and yet our argument in favour of protracted meetings remain untouched. The Scriptures contain instances of the *ordinary* means used at *special times* and under *special circumstances*; and this is precisely the case in Protracted Meetings. So with 'well accredited Revivals.' By the way, we have no doubt there have been many 'well accredited Revivals,' of which our friend knows comparatively little. He only talks largely when he presumes to speak of 'the whole history of well accredited Revivals.' This is only flourish and captandum. Were he to say he never knew, or read or heard of, a revival of religion, where there was no preaching, no praying, &c., we would agree with him; but such is not the case with protracted meetings, as we have shown repeatedly. But if all 'well accredited revivals' have only occurred by the divine blessing attending the use of the *ordinary* means, why does he charge us with unsoundness 'in the sacraments,' because we intimated, that we had never heard of 'baptism'—which he ranks among the 'extraordinary' means—having been administered, as a means, to attain the revival of God's work, as an end?"

3. "Dangerous in their consequences."

Reason assigned—"For they are calculated to operate upon the physical frame in such a way, as to delude the subjects into the notion that they have undergone a thorough and radical change of heart, when all that has been passed through is nothing more than a few natural emotions, called forth by external circumstances."

Answer—"We ask for some proof of this unavoidable and necessary tendency in the means used at Protracted Meetings. We cannot take the word of our opponent in this matter, unsupported by evidence, especially when we have found him bearing false witness against the Wesleyans on the important doctrine of original sin and justification by faith, and, though called upon repeatedly since he bore that testimony to prove or retract it, he has not had the candour nor the honesty to do one or the other. Apply his assertion to the means employed in promoting a revival in his own way, but at which are manifested 'those physical excitements, those convulsions of the human frame with which' he acknowledges 'true revivals are sometimes accompanied.'—And how would he answer the carping of some peevish opposer? He would tell him, that those 'outward demonstrations' may, and sometimes do, accompany the use of the ordinary means of grace, they are not necessary results—they are only accidents—a genuine revival may exist with or without them. In like manner, say we to the opposer of Protracted Meetings—the things to which you object, are not necessary, but accidental. It is no object of these meetings to produce them. If produced, they are repressed, and not encouraged. They are not regarded as affording the slightest evidence of conversion. But the work cannot be arrested because of these untoward circumstances."

This leads us to reiterate the charge of *self-contradiction* against the *Witness*. He admits a genuine work of God may exist although accompanied by 'physical excitements,' and yet he condemns 'protracted meetings' because of those excitements. He asks if we do not 'perceive' what he *could* be at. Yes—we see through the whole affair; nor does this require extraordinary discernment. In the one case he speaks of 'genuine revivals' where these physical convulsions *would* be expected—but why expected he says not—'as the accompaniments;' but 'in the other case, where there was little apparent experimental work of the Spirit, and where much if not all seemed to depend on physical frames and feelings.' Grant a man his premises, and he can prove white to be black and black to be white. His latter case is only *hypothetical*. He assumes that, in this case, there is no

genuine work of God—the thing to be proved; not merely asserted. But why does he assume this? Only on account of the 'physical frames &c.' which are manifested by certain persons. Yet, in the other case, he admits these 'physical frames,' in some persons, disprove not a genuine revival. Here then we maintain is a palpable contradiction: unless he can show, independently of the 'physical frames' of some, that the others are all deluded; and this he cannot do, unless he can read the heart and see what is occurring in the minds of men. Now we deny that all converts, or the greater number of them, at Protracted Meetings, have been deluded. 'By their fruits ye shall know them'; and we are prepared to show by the *subsequent* lives of vast numbers of these converts, that they give evidence of having experienced a genuine work of grace. If some have 'fallen' away, it is nothing more than what took place in Apostolic Churches under apostolic ministrations, and what has taken place in those modern revivals of which the *Witness* approves.

Instead of answering the questions we proposed, our friend has found it easier to leave them unnoticed, and to give a long letter purporting to contain an account of the 'whole proceedings' of what took place at one of these 'Protracted Meetings,' held in this Province some eighteen months ago, in which the name of 'Mr. B.'—flourishes largely. What he objects to in these 'whole proceedings' he has not stated; but we have read this account with care, and we see no unsound divinity in it from first to last—no statement that would imply that 'Mr. B.'—imagined the work of conversion was other than that of the Spirit. The only thing that can reasonably be considered objectionable, by the most fastidious, in these 'whole proceedings,' is the invitation to penitents to separate themselves from the congregation to be prayed for. There are many reasons why, in certain states of a congregation, the adoption of this course is advisable. But even this forms no essential part of a protracted meeting—which may be commenced, carried on, and terminated, without it. It is scarcely ever resorted to until there are unmistakable evidences of the outpouring of the Spirit and the consequent conviction of sinners—that is, until a revival has begun. In the conducting of a revival under any circumstances, much must be left to the discretion of those in charge; and after all the evidence that can be exercised, we doubt very much if the best revivals of modern times, conducted on the most approved principles, have been altogether free from human imperfection. And if our friend will acknowledge none as real, but those which have not even afforded the slightest ground of objection to the captious, we fear he must forthwith strike from his catalogue many, if not all, of those which heretofore he has rejoiced to acknowledge as genuine revivals of religion.

SUNDRIES.

Several incidental statements have been made by the *Witness* in the course of his controversy with us, that did our space permit, we should notice. But one or two of these we cannot pass over in silence. In his last editorial we find the following occurring—

"We are far from thinking it (Methodism) immaculate either in doctrine or government, as the *Wesleyan* seems to imagine it to be; and we shall not be deterred from faithfully expressing our sentiments in regard to what appears to us erroneous or contrary to the general analogy of faith, by whatever body maintained."

The intimation in the former part of this sentence has been thrown out more than once. We respectfully remind our cotemporary, that, on the immaculateness of Wesleyanism as to doctrine or government, we have not as yet expressed an opinion. The 'head and front of our offending' consist in this, that, when he, as censor general, in the faithful expression of his sentiments, thought proper to attack the Wesleyan Connexion on certain points, we, in the discharge of our duty, repelled his assault on those particular points; and with such effect that he has shrunk from the contest. As to his not being 'deterred' from the course marked out for himself, we have only to say, that, if his past treatment of the Wesleyans be a fair criterion by which we may judge of his future career, the 'body' he may attack can expect little justice at his hands. He has most unjustly criminated the 'whole system of Wesleyanism,' and yet when required to substantiate his charge by an appeal to the standards of Wesleyan doctrine, this champion, who boasts so loudly of his fearlessness, maintains a silence unworthy of an honourable opponent. Once more we say to him, meet us on the ground of fair and open discussion, and prove the unretorted charge against Wesleyan doctrine formerly made, and insinuated again in the last *Witness*. If our kind friend now refuse to answer—let him for ever tatter hold his peace.

Again—he says
"We had imagined him (ourselves) to be sound on the Sacraments, but we find we are mistaken."

And on what grounds does he assert that we are not 'sound on the Sacraments'? Because, when he ranked christian 'baptism' among the 'extraordinary means' of promoting a revival of religion, we intimated we could not see the reasons. We might have been wrong in our construction of that one design of baptism. But why does he not instruct our ignorance, and bring forward a single case of baptism having been performed by a cold and dead church, as a means, with the avowed object of promoting a revival, as an end? Nor until he shall do this, shall we admit that he has fairly met the case. From the manner in which he has brought forward the subject in his last Letter, a person, who had not seen our remarks, would naturally infer, that we had denied both the *Sacramental* character of baptism, and its further intended office 'of teaching the Church, and teaching her, in a very emphatic manner, even by signs, important and fundamental doctrine.' These truths we never questioned—they came not under our notice—they formed no part of the subjects in discussion—and therefore we never dreamed of the faithful *Witness* putting such an unwarranted construction on our remarks. Let him look into a Wesleyan Catechism and judge for himself whether, as Wesleyans, we are 'sound on the Sacraments' or not. Why does the *Witness* write in this random way? Or spread over the country charges and insinuations against us which he ought to know have no foundation in truth? The flippancy of the *Witness* respecting us as a body of Evangelical Christians, is not only unbecoming, but offensive. He must reason more, and declaim less—sustain his charges by fair argument, and not abound in mere assertions—condescend to adduce proof, and not deal in assumptions *ex cathedra*—if he would secure respect.

MIC MAC MISSION.

In our last we noticed the Meeting held in Granville Street Church for the promotion of the Christian Mission among the Indians undertaken by the Rev. SILAS T. RAND. On Sabbath last the Rev. Mr. Rand addressed large congregations in the Wesleyan Church, Brunswick Street, and in St. Andrew's Church, who listened to the statements made with marked interest. On Monday, another meeting, Dr. AVERY, in the Chair, was held at Chalmers Church, at which Mr. Rand, and several ministers of this city and some lay-men delivered animated and most interesting speeches, in support of this important Mission happily commenced. We are more than pleased that public attention has been so effectively drawn to the moral and religious state of the *aborigines* of this Province. They have strong and undeniable claims on the sympathies, and prayers, and pecuniary aid, of Christians of the various evangelical denominations, in furtherance and extension of the efforts now being made of bringing them more directly under the teachings and soul-converting power of the Gospel of the Blessed God. We cannot too highly commend the Rev. Mr. Rand for the unwearied assiduity manifested, and the great self-denial endured, by him in prosecuting his God-like work. Whilst he is willing to consecrate his time and his energies in the arduous endeavour of evangelizing and civilizing the members of this wandering and long-neglected tribe, the Christian public ought not to be lukewarm in the cause, not backward in furnishing

the requisite support. We need scarcely say that Mr. Rand has by dint of effort, and in the face of many obstacles, not only acquired a competent knowledge of the Mic Mac language, but has reduced it to written characters, and translated into it several portions of the Sacred Scriptures. His heart also is in this work, and nothing will satisfy him short of the instruction in divine truth, and the actual conversion of the souls, of the objects of his christian solicitude. We recommend this cause to the patronage of all with whom we have any influence; and our sincere prayer is, that God will open before this devoted Missionary 'a great door and effectual' and crown his labours with abundant success. Public meetings held in other parts of the Province in aid of the Mission, we have no doubt, would result in good.

Wesleyan Missions at Leeds, England.

Our District Missionary Anniversary is now being held. The first meeting was held at Brunswick Chapel last night. I do not now write to give you anything like a report of our anniversary proceedings, but simply to inform you that Leeds has spoken out on the question now agitating the Connexion—that of confidence in the Mission House, and in a way that cannot be misunderstood. The President of the Conference was in the chair—he stood 'at the bar of public opinion'—and he was not only acquitted of all malversation, but was most cordially and heartily welcomed among us. The speakers were the Rev. William Atherton, Chairman of the District, the Revs. G. Roebuck, William Arthur, Thomas H. Squance, and Joshua Burton, Esq. The subjects on which the meeting was most enthusiastic, were Mission-house management, Mission-house expenditure, the salaries of the Secretaries, stopping the supplies and confidence in the Executive. Other topics were touched upon by the various speakers, especially by Mr. Arthur; and I will now give you the verdict of that vast congregation—the collection amounted to £621. This does not include the collections made on the previous Sabbath, but is the amount of that day's collection!

This is not the first time that Leeds has struck the key-note for the Connexion on important questions affecting the interests of Missions and Methodism; and I have observed that, in every instance, other Circuits have either taken up the same, or a higher pitch, and have either gone on with us, or passed on before us. Let the faintest heart take courage—the ark of the Lord is safe—there is no fear for the cause of Missions now. In my mind that question is decided.

The adjourned meeting will be held in Oxford-place Chapel this evening. To-morrow morning we shall have a Public breakfast, and in the evening the Annual Sermon by the Rev. J. Sherman, of London. In addition to these, there will be the proceeds of the 'Ladies' Bazaar, now open, and the collections on Sunday; and I have no doubt that Leeds will return more from this anniversary by hundreds, than it has done on any former occasion.—*Correspondent of the Watchman.*

Leeds, October 30, 1849.

Sudden Death of the Rev. Dr. Byrth.

We have to perform a melancholy and affecting duty whilst preparing these pages for press this morning; and our regret to announce will, we are assured, be equalled by the sorrow with which our readers will learn the sudden decease of the Rev. Dr. Byrth, Rector of Wallasey. The circumstances under which this lamentable event occurred are, briefly, that yesterday, after concluding the afternoon service, the reverend gentleman returned to his house, and shortly afterwards retired to his library, accompanied by his little daughter, who, in a few minutes, observed that her father appeared to be indisposed. With promptitude she hastened to call Mrs. Byrth into the library, and Dr. Dunne, who was immediately sent for. That gentleman was quickly in attendance; but, unhappily, the valuable life had fled, and although all the aids which medical science could devise were put into operation, yet none were of avail. Such has been the sudden close of the Rev. Dr.