

motive dictated the appointment of the Rev. Doctor to that office, than that of wishing to influence the members of the Methodist Church in the general election, then to follow. It could not be for the want of another Deputy Superintendent, for Mr. Murray gave general satisfaction. It could not be that the office was vacant, when Mr. Ryerson began his defence; for if he is a competent witness, he declares that he never heard till August that the office was likely to be vacant. However this may be, he wrote in May, that he declined the office, and the letter of Junius is a proof of the prevalence of the rumor of the approaching vacancy. This letter was published May 31, and Mr. Ryerson's declaration of a refusal of the office, was published May 27. We do not point out this discrepancy with a view of reflecting personally on the individual, but to show that as the acceptance of the office by Mr. Ryerson would naturally lead the public to conclude, that he had entered into the design imputed to Sir Charles Metcalfe's Government, it was not good policy to accept the office at that time. The appointment could not be dictated by a reference to the ability and general eligibility of the individual, for as to scholastic qualification, he was evidently deficient; as to peculiar fitness there was no ground to believe he had any claim on that account; and as to the policy of appointing a person to the office, not of the Church of England, it was very questionable, it being sure to displease a large portion of the Government's firmest supporters, who, are now, as appears in the Cobourg Church, only suffering the appointment, till a favourable opportunity arrives to procure his dismissal.

Nor was it the known adhesion of Mr. Ryerson to the political principles avowed by Sir Charles Metcalfe's Government, that led to the appointment. On the contrary, Mr. Ryerson opposed those principles up to the time of commencing his defence. The only rational way of accounting for the appointment was, his reputation as an influential member of the Methodist Conference, with the additional ground, that as his influence had been successfully exerted in the time of Sir F. B. Head's it was presumed the effect would be the same in favour of Sir Charles Metcalfe's Government. The letter of Junius so fully explains this part of the subject that it is unnecessary to make further remarks on it.

The next document we refer to, is the address of the official members in the Toronto City Station. The sole reason for issuing this address was, to protest against the members of the Church being identified with Mr. Ryerson's proceedings in political controversy. This has been sufficiently circulated to be already too well known, to require insertion on the present occasion. There was nothing in its spirit and language in opposition to the best interests of the Methodist Church.

We next draw attention to two letters numbered 4xx and 5, from the Rev. E. Ryerson; the first, in reply to the Toronto Station Address, and the other on the same subject. They contain a denial of the intention charged

against him of endeavouring to push his defence of the Governor-General into the columns of the Christian Guardian. It must be observed that by his words "my defence" he refers to the long series of letters inserted in the Colonist. We do not think he ever intended to insert these in the Guardian; for he must have known of the existing rule and pledge of the Conference against such a proceeding. Besides, it might not answer his purpose so well. It would have led to more resistance on the part of the Methodist Body, and have turned them unanimously against him. But the words "my defence" have a general meaning, when spoken of by others, and referred to as *his defence*—they may refer to any other article in defence of Sir Charles Metcalfe, which he might have wished to have inserted in the Christian Guardian.

To the definite meaning of the words "my defence," as referring to the publications in the British Colonist—the expressions in the letters of the Rev. Mr. John Ryerson, and the Rev. A. McNab, No. 6, will fully apply. So also, the denial in Mr. Ryerson's letter of Sep. 13, No. 5, and the letter contained in paper No. 6, clears Mr. Ryerson with reference to any such intention as to that defence, and also, with reference to certain papers read at a meeting of the Book Committee, held in Toronto, in April last; and also, with reference to the private correspondence of Mr. Ryerson, which came into the hands of Mr. McNab. But, there is also a letter from Mr. Scott, the former Editor of the Guardian, who had better opportunities than Mr. McNab, of knowing what communications were intended for insertion in the Guardian. The former two witnesses, can only say as to what had not come to their knowledge as proceeding from Mr. Ryerson, with that view; but Mr. Scott, can say what had. We refer to his letter, No. 9, herewith inserted. Here we have positive evidence from Mr. Scott, that he had received an article from Mr. Ryerson, which he declined publishing, because it favoured one of the parties in the political dispute prevailing in the Province, or to speak plainly, it was in defence of Sir Charles Metcalfe. The negative evidence of Mr. John Ryerson, and of Mr. McNab, must be entirely disregarded, in the presence of the positive evidence of Mr. Scott.

The next document in rotation, is a letter signed "an Official Member" marked No. 4x. This is on the general subject of Mr. Ryerson's public character. It shows by his history the habitual tendency of his mind to engage in politics, the versatility of his mind, having been Republican, Radical, Whig, and Tory, by turns and often, and the fact of his influence in the Conference, having caused the withdrawal of many from that body. On this letter, no further remarks are necessary.

A rejoinder to letter No. 4, follows from the official members of the Toronto Station. With reference to this rejoinder, we thought proper to omit a great portion of Mr. Ryerson's professed reply as being altogether irrelevant. We make a corresponding omission in the rejoinder, in which these irrelevant matters are replied to, and only insert a reply

to that portion of Mr. Ryerson's letter which referred to the address. This part we have already disposed of.

The next document, No. 7, is a letter to the President of the Conference. It treats of the political bias of Mr. Ryerson's mind and his inconsistency, and proves his unfitness for the important office of a Preacher of the Gospel. It is not materially connected with the present article; we recommend however, an attentive perusal.

The letter No. 7, is replied to by the Rev. H. Wilkinson, in a letter to the Editor of the Globe, Sep. 21st, in consequence, as the writer says, of its containing to use his own words, "*a vile slander*" against himself. Mr. Wilkinson's letter gives a contradiction to that part of the letter to the President of the Conference, which states that a memorial was delivered to him for presentation to the Conference which was suppressed by Mr. Wilkinson, it also includes that he took part in that memorial, and wished to *be sent strong to Conference*, and suggests that fear of Mr. Ryerson's influence there directed the suppression of the memorial. This portion of the letter is called a vile slander.

Whether this charge refers to all the facts therein stated, or part of them, or to the conjecture as to the suppression being caused by fear of Mr. Ryerson's influence, we cannot say. This he ought to have explained, unless he means to characterize the whole as a vile slander. In that case, the parties will no doubt feel it necessary to prove 'his part of their case.

Mr. Wilkinson's letter of the 21st Sept., is followed by a reply in the Globe of the same date, which we regret to say, places the issue on the veracity of the parties. The final decision waits the response of Mr. Wilkinson, which if he does not give, the decision is easy to those who will read the documents. The readers attention is now directed to a letter marked No. 8, from the Rev. R. Jones, President of the Conference, in reply to a letter addressed to him by "a member of the Wesleyan Methodist Church."

We think Mr. Jones's reply, as it is called, is no reply to the facts of his opponent. Its blustering formality reminds us of the orthodoxy of the Town Clerk of Ephesus, who confidently appealed to the people, that they all knew that the Ephesians were worshippers of the great goddess Diana, and of the image which fell down from Jupiter, stating, that these things could not be spoken against. With the exception that the writer of the letter marked No. 7, is not answered. The President's letter is calculated to assure the members of the Church of his desire, to confine the labours of the Ministry to the essential object of their calling, "to spread scriptural holiness through the land." As we insert the whole letter, further remarks are unnecessary.

The letter marked No. 10, from Mr. Ryerson, to the Editor of the Examiner, is the next in rotation. In it there are many things not essentially connected with our object, viz: his defence of himself against the Provincial Press. We refer to the letter for these matters, we shall only fix attention to one or