

LETTER I.

To the Editor of "The Church."

Toronto, April 12, 1843.

SIR :

In taking the liberty thus publicly to address you on certain topics suggested, or rather forced upon my consideration, by the virulent article which occupies the first column of your paper of the 7th instant, I feel that apology would savour too much of affectation. I deem it equally superfluous to offer any explanation of my motive in availing myself of the courtesy of the present medium of communication, instead of troubling you personally. From one, the Papal arrogance of whose bearing towards members of his own communion when they chance to come in collision with his oracular judgment, and whose bitter and aggressive hostility against all others, constitute his most prominent distinction as a religious journalist, I have no favours to expect, and am therefore thankful that I have none to solicit.

Extravagant, indeed, as are the pretensions put forth in the article referred to, and offensive as its tone must be to those of your own Church, whose christian charity will not admit of being pent up within the little enclosure which affords, it seems, ample scope for all of that quality which you possess yourself, it contains little, I confess, to excite the surprise of any but those who know not what manner of spirit you are of. "The Church" had not long fallen into your hands when its readers became familiarized to such phenomena. Their novelty is gone.

Tritus, et a medio fortunæ ductus æervo :

And if the recent effusion of your righteous indignation against inconsistent Churchmen, and incorrigible Dissenters, is more turbid, as well as more copious and violent than previous emanations from the same fountain, the forced and pruden-

tial repression of its overflow for a longer period than usual, probably affords the true solution of the difference.

The proximate cause of this transport of your displeasure, no one can mistake. A gentleman, a member of the Church of England,—the rectitude of whose character we believe, is unimpeachable, whose respect for the institutions and precepts of Christianity, would, perhaps, sustain no very disadvantageous comparison with your own, and who worthily wears the highest civic honours by which this community can express its appreciation of his talents and virtues, stands charged among others by you, with a gross infraction of the unity of the Church, because he had the temerity, on a late occasion, to attend and preside at a Wesleyan Missionary Anniversary.

There can exist no doubt that had that gentleman been as fully convinced of your infallibility and ghostly authority as you would seem to be yourself, he would have felt it imperative upon him to preclude the visitation of your grave condemnation ; for, by no possibility, could he have been ignorant at the time, of your stereotyped decisions on such important points of casuistry.

But the deed is done ! His Worship, the Mayor of the City of Toronto, has had the audacity, your dictation to the contrary notwithstanding, to extend the hand of fraternal recognition and encouragement, to a class of Christians whom God—I speak it not boastfully—has signally owned in their evangelistic labours for more than a century, though *they follow not with you*. And, forsooth, because that gentleman, like many of the most enlightened and estimable members of the Church of England in this Province, has not bowed down and worshipped the image which you have set up—because he does not think proper at

your
vilege
judgm
he wil
ing to
recogn
chara
and p
fellow
—as c
gious
been—
of a
pose c
It
intimi
princi
whom
were
of spi
tests
neer
tration
christ
tical
ment,
ter o
branch
stigma
picabl
fluenc
indica
tianit
wisdo
worth
an ab
a neg
but t
convic
they v

Your
your

* See
the Ch
20, 184