

Whatever, therefore, other Churches may do with regard to the use of the Press, the Conference of the Wesleyan Methodist Church cannot complain of the use of it among the members of the Church, while they keep their organ, they cannot object to their people having an Advocate. Our readers have no doubt just heard from the Missionary platform of the advantages of the Press in the circulation of the Holy Scriptures. The Press, we believe, was honoured in having the Bible almost for its first work, and Luther was indebted to it for the more rapid and extensive circulation of his Reform Doctrines. After these references to the use of the Press by the Wesleyan Methodist Church, will it be believed that any of the members of the Conference have commenced a species of opposition to our journal, and to those who patronise it, almost amounting to persecution. We have been informed that it has been saluted by some of them with epithets of no very complimentary nature—such as libellous, scurrilous, and slanderous. We have no great objection to these attacks because they show the strength of our position, and improve it.

When it becomes known throughout Western Canada, that the organ of the Conference dares not to meet the charges we have made against a few leaders of the Conference; this under current opposition will be regarded by the people with the same indifference as we regard it. When we have attacked them openly, without personality, and only desire truth to be proved, and to prevail on whichever side it may be found; when it is seen they can only reply by coarse epithets, and such kind of opposition as is implied in the following extracts from letters recently received from various parts of the province, we shall not say any thing to add to the mortification such persons will feel when they see the public are convinced that they have no other means of opposing this journal. They have a journal at their entire disposal, and have no excuse for concealed opposition; but they have neither facts nor arguments to put in it, in answer to those produced by us.

We vouch for the authenticity of the following extracts of a letter, just received:—The writer says, “you are aware that I am a business man, and you will not be surprised to learn, that the very fact of my opening my mouth on the subject of lay-Delegation, has enlisted the opposition of some of the Wesleyan Clergy, who have withdrawn themselves from my store, and have tried to induce others also. I despise such men, and I believe the day of high-handed rule is nearly at an end.”

For the consolation of such Gentlemen, we add, that the other side of the letter contained a long list of Subscribers to the “Wesleyan Methodist,” with remittances. The following is from another letter, “I send you five subscribers and remittance, and should have done so before, but was informed by a member of the Conference, that some of the causes that have brought forth the “Wesleyan” had been satisfactorily explained, and that those who were Mr. Wilkinson’s violent opposers, were now reconciled, and had become

his friends, and that the excitement was nearly allayed. I have also been informed by other members of the Conference, that it was of no use for us to agitate the question of lay-delegation; for we would never get it; and, that if every member of the Conference was in favour of it, they could not grant it, for it was contrary to discipline. I would ask what is discipline? Is it what it was fifteen years ago? Was it never altered?”

In the above extract we have quite a different description of opposition; here recourse is had to invention. We might after the example of one of the dominant nine, say a “*tissue of falsehoods*,” but we decline the use of such terms, we shall only say for the information of our correspondent, that no explanation of any kind has taken place, nor is there any excitement allayed. As to reconciliation with Mr. Wilkinson, and having become friends, there can be no reconciliation with him, as there was no personal opposition, at least none opposed to friendship; though we respect him personally, we feel it our duty to oppose the position he holds in the Conference. There is nothing to induce us to relax in our exertions to accomplish the object we have in view; so far from it, that instead of dropping our publication at the end of six months, our arrangements are nearly completed for its permanent continuance.

Those who wait to see its dissolution at the end of six months, and then, intend to come out *bravely* against a retired opponent, will be disappointed of the opportunity of exhibiting so much courage. Another correspondent writes, “We think highly of your paper, and hope that it will be well supported; such a paper is very much needed in our day and generation.”

Another writes, “I wish to say, that I was very much pleased to hear of your determination to endeavour to bring about a change of discipline, allowing Lay-Representatives a seat in Conference, as I believe it is the will of Heaven, and the undeniable right of the Laity, though long usurped by the Priesthood.”

Another, “Strong opposition here to your measures. Priestly influence determined.”

We have already exhibited many serious abuses of power on the part of the leaders of the Conference, and shown the nature of the opposition we are to meet with. We invite therefore, the co-operation of all the friends of religious liberty throughout the Methodist community. The question is, whether you will submit to a despotism, intolerable to every independent mind; as that is inevitable if you do not give us your hearty support. You know our motive to be pure and our object to be good, and that we make no individual profit of this journal; we undertake the pecuniary burden cheerfully, though it may be expensive for a few months. We do not believe that the liberal minded Methodists of Canada, will permit us to have this honour to ourselves. To the Societies in London, Brantford, Mount Pleasant, St. Catharines, Hamilton, Coburg, Port Hope, Prince Edward, Picton, Belleville, Bath, Kingston, &c, we say, aid us in our laudable

undertaking, read our journal for yourselves, and send us subscribers plentifully. We take this opportunity of acknowledging the receipt since our last, of letters with subscriptions and remittances, from the following places,—Cobourg, Hamilton, Nelson, Waterdown, York, Brantford, Dundas, Nasaguangu, Picton, Normandale, Cayuga, West Plamborough, Wellington Square, Colborne, St. John’s C. W., Darlington, Whitby, Napance, Cumberland, Buckingham, Grantham, Beamsville, Grimsby, and St. Catharines.

We also congratulate the friends of this undertaking, on the great success that has attended our publication for the first three months, and thank all its supporters, and trust that both they and we, may receive our reward in the accomplishment of the ultimate object of our undertaking—the purity, efficiency, and unity of the Wesleyan Methodist Church.

CHAIRMEN OF DISTRICTS AND THE MISSIONARY FUND.

In our last number we made a brief reply to a correspondent, on the subject of paying the Chairmen of Districts out of the Missionary money. We had then no space for any extended remarks on the subject: but, finding it necessary, we take the present opportunity to do so.

It appears, that the amount paid to the six Chairmen of Districts is £50, per annum, each. So far it is clear, that the sum of £300, per annum, is appropriated for this purpose, out of the amount raised for the Missionary cause. We have heard it stated, on good verbal authority, that the appropriation in question is an act of economy, and which is thus explained:—Formerly a Missionary agent was employed, but now that office was dispensed with, the duty being performed by Chairmen of Districts. Consequently, this payment out of the Missionary fund, relieve the respective Quarterly Meetings of a part of the amount formerly paid to the Chairmen of Districts. Both duties being discharged by the same persons, they are paid out of the separate funds appropriated for both, and neither, to the same amount as if a Missionary Agent had been employed.

If this is a true statement, and we have every reason to believe it is, it is our duty to object to the economy of such an arrangement. In the first place, there never was occasion for a Missionary Agent. If we are rightly acquainted with the history of our Church, that office is one of recent creation; the occasion of creating it arose accidentally, through a respected member of the Conference being either about to retire, or unable to take a regular circuit, and who, owing to eminent usefulness, was appointed Missionary Agent. At one time these duties were performed as they are now, and without any diminution of the Missionary fund for that service; therefore, it cannot be economy to pay additionally for the performance of duties which had been performed without such payment, until a Missionary Agent was appointed.

In the second place, that Missionary Agent had only £150 per annum, while the present