

have laid down in my pamphlet. This position I have supported by an examination such objections as had come within the compass of my own knowledge, and a comparison of them with extracts from the writings of Wesley *stale quotations* as you are pleased to call them, but stale or fresh, draw from the fountain head of the standard edition of his works. Although I cannot perceive the force of your objection, to state quotations, as, it they had any authority when first extracted frequency of quotation would not take away this authority, this I repeat is my position, and is the principal object I had in view in addressing those calling themselves Wesleyans. I defy you Sir to controvert that position, or to prove that I have garbled the extracts I have taken from the works of your founder or misrepresented his sentiments. Until you have done this, I shall still consider that Modern methodism is not Wesleyan methodism, and therefore that you have no claim to the name of Wesleyan.

2. "The Church persecuted and mobbed Mr. Wesley." This assertion I think would be best met by its contrary, "The Church did not persecute nor mob Mr. Wesley." Let these assertions be weighed by direct reference to Mr. Wesley's own testimony, and I have no doubt that it will be allowed by an impartial judge that your's is untenable. I have shown in page 39 of my letter that during 51 years the number of refusals to permit him to preach in Churches were 35, of which only 21 were by clergymen, while during the same period he preached in 512 churches. Does this look like persecution, especially when we remember that he acknowledged that he had more invitations to preach in churches that he could possibly accept of? But you may say he was mobbed. I do not deny it, but I say that it was not by the Church. He was mobbed, I believe at Walsall, but is a Walsall mob the Church? What principles of special pleading will show that a very insignificant part is the whole. Allow me to put your assertions before your readers in a syllogistic form.

Mr. Wesley was mobbed at Walsall and other places.

Some of these mobs may have consisted of persons belonging to the Church, therefore: The Church mobbed Mr. Wesley!!! Would not the most inexperienced logician perceive the inadequacy of your proof and consider it invalid. I now put to you Sir, this question, I ask on this subject in my letter "Can you Mr. Editor, or any other individual, shew that Mr. Wesley was 'legally shut out of the Church by excommunication or deposition, or that he was prevented 'from preaching in any of the churches of England by episcopal inhibition.' Until you have proved that he was talk no more of persecution."

3. "The Church disowned those of its adherents who had been saved from their sins through his instrumentality." To this assertion I give the most complete contradiction; bring forward if you can, a single proof in support of your assertion. This Sir, you cannot do. You may try to prove it by stating that some ministers opposed Methodism and Methodists, but some ministers are not the Church, and opposing Methodists is not disowning the adherents of the Church. You are well aware that the cutting off members from the Church can only be effected by judicial proceedings, and also that such proceedings have never been taken against any individual because of his connection with Methodism. I cannot avoid considering such an assertion as a gross and palpable untruth, and unworthy the pen of any individual pretending to the unequivocal tokens of the Divine favour, to which you refer.

4. "That the writer of that pamphlet is a 'Romanizing teacher &c.'" It is always the part of an unskilful arguer to make up in abuse what he is deficient in reasoning, and this Sir you have endeavoured to do as fully as you can. You are pleased to heap upon that unfortunate individual, epithets more suitable for a contentious workman than a spiritually minded Methodist preacher, e. g. self constituted teacher, Romanizing teacher, unfair representor of Wesley's sentiments, false representor of the same, a propounder of the dogma of a Puseyite creed, a supporter of old views, fables, &c., a purblind advocate of a visionary scheme of sacramental salvation, a most wilful and stupid perverter of Wesley's sentiments, one ignorant of the principles of true religion &c. &c. But would it not have been far more becoming to deal less in invective and more in reasoning. Passing by my being a self constituted teacher which you know is not the case, let me ask in what respect am I a Romanizer &c., and is it for quoting Wesley's views, or certain parts on which you differ from him, and I only agree with him. If so your righteous indignation should have been expended on John Wesley, not on John Fletcher. Bring forward one and I shall at once acknowledge that I am wrong in doing so.

5. "Mr. Wesley was not a supporter of baptismal regeneration." Why Sir, I cannot repress my astonishment at your boldness in making such an assertion in the face of the proofs which I have brought forward to the contrary. What does he mean in your 476, 477, and 740 Hymns by rising and washing away sins in baptism, by being plunged by it into a second birth by God's annexing in it the Spirit's Seal? What does he mean when he says that the outward sign duly received is always accompanied with the inward grace? What does he mean when he says by baptism we who were by nature the Children of wrath are made the Children of God, and that by this re-

generation we are made the Children of God by adoption, not grace? What does he mean when he says, who denies that you were then made Children of God and heirs of heaven? There can be no meaning in words if these do not plainly and distinctly shew that he supported this doctrine.

6. "The Church forced Mr. Wesley to take the position that Methodism now occupies, and to provide an ecclesiastical arrangement for his Society." The position Methodism now occupies was not taken until after the death of Mr. Wesley, and consequently not by himself. Up to that time it was in a position of friendship towards the Church, and afterwards of enmity; so that the final part of this statement is false, and the second is equally so, for the ecclesiastical organization (as I have shewn on Methodist testimony) arose from the pressure from without in 1792 and 1816, and therefore was not provided by him.

7. "The Church is a fallen Church." I am afraid your sub-editor is not kept under proper check or else that your memory must be exceedingly defective since in a recent number of your paper a letter appeared that was copied into other papers which shewed that the Church so far from being fallen is manifesting signs of a vitality far exceeding that of any other denomination of professing Christians, so that your assertions in one issue is contradicted by an opposite assertion in another.

There are other misstatements in your article that would require some remarks upon them, but I think that I have said enough to show that you have either willfully, or I hope, ignorantly perverted the truth, and shall, therefore, pass them by unnoticed, merely recommending you in conclusion, not to arrogate to yourself and your Society the influences of the Spirit: nor to imagine that you alone are the people of the Lord, for such assumptions are too frequently the strongest evidences that those who make them have not the Spirit of Christ.

I am Sir, your's respectfully,
JOHN FLETCHER.

(To the Editor of the Canadian Churchman.)

REV. AND DEAR SIR.—As the motion of the Hon. Geo. Boulton, and the amendment moved by the Hon. P. B. DeBlaquiere, at the last monthly meeting of the Church Society together with the names of those who voted for and against those motions will appear in the columns of your journal. I feel myself constrained to adopt the same medium in order to say that upon the occasion in question, I for one voted under a misapprehension.

The information called for, by the motion and the amendment in question, if embodied in a written document and placed among the records of the Society for the use of members thereof, is, I conceive most desirable.

The original motion, with the amendment proposed appeared to me to present two modes in which this necessary information might be obtained, and owing to ignorance of the exact mode of proceeding in the case of a division, I was under the impression that our votes were simply determining not whether the information desired was or was not to be obtained, for that desire seemed with only two or three exceptions to be unanimous, but which of the two methods proposed for procuring it should be adopted.

It is not easy to express the annoyance experienced on finding that, in common with some others, I had, owing to this misconception assisted in "shelving" the whole matter.

Though strongly averse to taking so public a mode of making this statement, I prefer to do so rather than be supposed capable of aiding to "stifle" information which whether it be necessary or not is unquestionably desired by a large number of the members of the Society.

No trace of any wish to withhold the information in question appeared to me to actuate any member of the board on Wednesday last—all were perfectly willing that the information moved should be, obtained though one or two gentlemen considered it unnecessary—There cannot be a question that but for the misapprehension alluded to, if one method of obtaining it had failed the other would have been carried.

I remain
faithfully yours,
W. STEWART DAYLING.

Scarboro,
Feb. 5, 1853.

Canadian Churchman.

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 17, 1853.

THE REPORT OF THE BISHOP OF TORONTO, TO THE MOST HON'BLE THE DUKE OF NEWCASTLE, HER MAJESTY'S SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES, ON THE SUBJECT OF THE COLONIAL CHURCH.

Toronto, Upper Canada, Feb. 4th, 1853

MY LORD DUKE,—On my return from a confirmation of several months to this place, in September last, I found the following circular letter which had arrived during my absence, from the Right Honorable Sir John Packington, Bart., then Secretary of State for the Colonies:—

Downing Street, 30th July, 1852.

MY LORD,—As your Lordship must naturally feel much interested in the debates of last Session in the House of Commons, upon

the Bill brought in by Mr. Gladstone, for regulating the Church of England in the Colonies, I forward to your Lordship some copies of the Speech in which I stated my objections to Mr. Gladstone's measure.

I also send your Lordship copies of the Bill, which Mr. Gladstone subsequently introduced—but which was not discussed in the House.

The subject will be renewed in the next Session of Parliament, and in the event of Legislation upon it by her Majesty's Government, it will afford me much assistance if your Lordship will favour me with your opinion upon the present state of the Church in your Diocese, and what Legislative changes you would suggest in order to place the Church in your Diocese in a more efficient and satisfactory position.

I have the honor to be,
My Lord,
Your Lordship's
Most ob't Servant,
(Signed,) JOHN S. PACKINGTON.

The Lord Bishop
of Toronto.

Not supposing that the measure would be taken up in the early Session of November, I addressed a circular letter to my Rural Deans with copies of Mr. Gladstone's Bill, and of Sir John Packington's speech, desiring them to consult the Clergy and others of their respective Deaneries, and report to me, at their early convenience.

On receiving their reports I consulted with some able friends, and more particularly with the Chief Justice of the Colony—and have now the honor to enclose for the information of your Grace the result of our combined deliberations.

I have the honor to be,
My Lord Duke,
Your Grace's
Most ob't Servant,
JOHN TORONTO.

His Grace, the Duke of Newcastle,
Her Majesty's Secretary of State
for the Colonies.
Downing Street, London.

CONVOCATION.

It is now generally admitted that the rapid growth of the United Church of England and Ireland in the Colonies, and the great increase of the Clergy present new and urgent arguments for some ruling power to enforce stricter discipline and greater efficiency and uniformity of action than she has yet enjoyed.

When the lay members of the Church in the various dependencies of the British Empire are believed to exceed one million, and one diocese (Upper Canada) approaches one fourth of that number, with several hundred clergymen scattered over vast regions and thus far separated one from another, it must needs be that grave difficulties and offences will arise, and how are they to be dealt with.

The Bishops are in most cases powerless, having indeed jurisdiction by their Royal appointment and Divine Commission, but no tribunals to try cases, and to acquit or punish as the case may require.

Hence they feel themselves frequently weak and unable to correct reckless insubordination, sullen contumacy and even immoral conduct. At one time they are accused of feebleness and irresolution—at another, when acting with some rigour, they are denounced as tyrannical and despotic.

On all such occasions they are without support or the refreshing counsel of their Brethren—nor have they any Constitutional way open to them by which they can devise and mature such measures as may be found necessary for the welfare and extension of the Church.

The growing evil and inconvenience of this state of things has at length forced itself upon the notice of the Imperial Government, and a Bill has been introduced into Parliament by the Right Honorable William Gladstone, which seeks to place Church affairs in the Colonies under the government of an uniform and well defined system. And, although the Secretary of State, Sir John Packington, offered some well founded objections to the proposed Bill, he frankly admitted that the Church in the Colonies laboured under great disadvantages, and that it stood in need of legislative assistance, in order to enable it to make such regulations as are essential to its proper functions. Both Statesmen consider legislation necessary, although they differ in the details; and both appear desirous to avail themselves of the advice and assistance of the Colonial Bishops and their Clergy, in dealing with this question, which is certainly not a light one.

The Bill as amended, has not only been sent out to the different Colonies to be submitted to the judgment of the Bishops, Clergy and Laity, but one Bishop at least from the different groups of Colonial Dioceses has been invited to England to assist

in its modification so that it may meet the purpose for which it is intended,—or rather, to assist in framing a Constitution for the Colonial Church, which would ensure uniformity in all essentials to her efficiency within the Colony and at the same time preserve harmony with the Mother Church.

And surely the little delay required in pursuing this course need not be grudged after allowing 200 years and more to pass, without doing anything, when the result may be the digesting and maturing a respectable safe and rational scheme which would give full efficiency to the United Church of England and Ireland, and insure through all future time among her numerous branches, perfect unity in all parts of the world.

Besides the Bishops and such of their clergy as visit England on this important object, those who remain in their Dioceses are expected to give their own views, and in as far as may be those of their Clergy and Laity, so that the result may be justly considered the voice of the Colonial Church at large.

Now, although we may not reckon very much upon the positive benefit to be derived from the multitude of suggestions which will be brought forward, yet there would be the advantage of considering beforehand, whatever would be likely to be urged in the Colonies for or against the act before it had passed. Besides the moral effect would be of great value by showing the members of the Church in the Colonies, that a measure so important had not been agreed upon without due reference to their wishes and sentiments,—and in the next place it would be much more easy to support the system afterwards against any attempts to unsettle it as being a system established on mature consideration and with a desire to meet the views and opinions of the various Colonies.

Even after all this previous care and deliberation, it might be wise to limit the continuance of the measure on its first enactment to four or five years and in the meantime to invite an expression of opinion from the different Colonies as to the working of its various provisions so that it may be made as perfect as possible, before it becomes a permanent law.

The system by which the Episcopal Church in the United States of America is governed, and that in Scotland, would naturally be considered in framing the Constitution of the Colonial Church and some hints might possibly be derived even from the footing on which the Protestant Church has been placed by the late acts of the Government in France.

The members of the Episcopal Church of the United States were unavoidably influenced in laying the foundation of their system by considerations which do not apply in our case. They would not submit to a controlling power in a foreign country, for that would have placed their Church in a disadvantageous light before the public.

With us there need not be, and is not in fact any jealousy of the kind, on the contrary I believe the general feeling of the Laity as well as the Clergy at present would be found to be in favour of seeking security against error and against rash changes by having all material points subject to the control of the Mother Church, and not left to be debated or resolved upon by Colonial Conventions or convocations.

Let us suppose then a Constitution framed in England under the best advice and upon mature consideration, the most desirable course would, I think, be to give that Church Constitution to the Colonies by an Imperial Statute.

But, where we apprehend a difficulty will present itself if the Bill should go into such details in regard to Church government and discipline as it ought to do. Would the House of Commons entertain it? and would the Government ask them to do so with the hope of a satisfactory result? I hope they could; but I fear they could not.

If the Government could and would proceed in that manner, and if a Statute could be passed, approved of by the heads of the Church and placing the Church of England in the Colonies on firmer ground as to doctrine and discipline, a very great object would be gained because then the Convocation or whatever it might be called, within each Diocese, not having these matters within their reach (and I think they ought not) would be occupied only in such things as would not disturb the unity of the Church, that is, in enforcing the power given by the Constitution in regard to discipline and in regulating and advancing her temporal interests.

This great advantage would follow from leaving our System of Church Government resting on such a foundation, as could not be readily disturbed; for it would not be easy to procure any alteration of what had been so carefully considered. And we might hope that the Constitution would be found to be sustained by the general voice of the Colonies, although there might be an unfortunate spirit