

the authors. We shall not defend the former, or oppose the latter. This Journal assumes no responsibility for those past transactions, though they are referred to for the purpose already stated.

The first document marked No. 1, is the announcement from Mr. Ryerson himself, of his intention to defend the position of Sir C. Metcalfe. Our readers are well aware of the position of the Rev. Egerton Ryerson, of the solemn consecration of himself—his time, talents, and influence; to the spiritual work in connection with the Wesleyan Methodist Church. They are aware, also, that he held an important office in that Church, being the Principal of Victoria College, as well as a Preacher of the Gospel; yet these obligations, it appears, did not deter him from the undertaking.

We direct the reader to the fact of his interference as being voluntary, as he says, "unsolicited by any human being" which makes his interference less excusable, if he really had higher obligations. We also refer to the tone of language in which he devotes himself to a work inferior to the obligations already laid upon him: that, "he is ready to relinquish any situation he now fills, rather than not accomplish this imperative undertaking," which is in our opinion equal to a revocation of his Ordination vows. We think that the Rev. Gentleman has made a mistake in comparing himself with Leonidas. His enthusiasm and devotion to politics reminds us more of the celebrated Maid of Orleans, Joan of Arc. In another place, if we have space, we shall insert the twelve rules from the discipline of the Methodist Church. Dr. Adam Clarke's opinion of the public interference of Ministers in politics, and the opinions and decisions of the British Conference on the same subject.

We ask our readers in reference to these documents, as well as by appeal to their own unbiassed judgment, whether Mr. Egerton Ryerson has conformed to the discipline of the Church and the spirit and object of the institutions of Methodism? In the event of our not having space in the first number, for all the above mentioned documents, we insert the following from the Book of Discipline, of the Wesleyan Methodist Church, "*on the duty of Preachers.*" Rule II,—"*You have nothing to do but to save souls; therefore spend and be spent in this work.*"

We also request attention to two other points,—viz., the date of the announcement, and the declaration that he had declined the office of Deputy Superintendent of Education. These two circumstances involve Mr. Ryerson in a difficulty mentioned hereafter.

The next event in the history of the present agitation in the Methodist Church, was the preparation of a memorial to the approaching Conference, on the part of the official members of the Church in Toronto. This Memorial was put into the hands of the Superintending Minister on the Station, who not only readily undertook to present it to the Conference, but so participated in the measure, that he requested to be sent strong to Conference," in order to give effect to the Memorial. The Memorial in question was

not presented, and consequently, that portion of the Church represented by those official members, were deprived of their just right of communicating with the Conference, on the only occasion which, according to the institutions of Methodism, is afforded them. We only state facts on this part of the subject, by no means blaming the Minister referred to. He, doubtless, took the course he thought best, but the result is undeniable—the members of the Church in their Official Quarterly Meeting can have no communication with the Conference, and no influence on their deliberations, unless the Minister at the head of each Station pleases. This alone, justifies an appeal to our brethren throughout the Province, through the medium of the Press; and that no more offence may be given, by employing the Provincial Press generally; it has been resolved to have a Press solely appropriated to the purpose; to which we invite the support of the members of the Church throughout the province.

The Memorial, in question, contained a respectful intimation that the public interference in political controversy of the Rev. Egerton Ryerson, was in opposition to the spirit and object of the Methodist system, and prejudicial to religion generally; and its tendency was, to draw from the Conference a declaration to that effect. No motive can be conceived for the suppression of the Memorial, but the existence of an influence in the Conference favourable to Mr. Ryerson on some grounds, which even his evident departure from Methodist principles, could not weaken.

We here see the necessity of having recourse to some expedient in opposing the influence of a few leading men in the Conference—an influence which is exercised to the exclusion of all just and reasonable opposition, on the part of the overruled majority in that body. It appears to us, that only the Press can do this, and that, by insisting on the practice of the first principles of Methodism, and by pointing to the consequence of the supremacy of an ecclesiastical aristocracy, which appears to have been facilitated, and confirmed, by excluding the interference of the laity in the affairs of the Church.

Though there may be particular affairs of the Church, which we shall hereafter point out, that would be better regulated by admitting some of the leading members of the Church into the Conference, it is not on this account alone, that a Press is resorted to. It is chiefly in view of the imminent danger to religion itself, and to Methodism in particular,—the natural consequence of the conduct of the Rev. Egerton Ryerson, from his presumed motive, and the obvious means resorted to by him to accomplish the object he had in view.

The motive we believe to have been, to obtain pecuniary government assistance to the Church, and to Victoria College, and the means of obtaining the support of the members of the body to the political party supporting the Governor-General, in the recent constitutional dispute in the Province. That this was the instrumentality to be employed, there can be no doubt, and it constitutes an

unpardonable outrage on the civil rights and privileges of the members of the Church. Such conduct must lead to a decision of no important question, whether it is to be repeated again or not; this not being the first instance of it. The decision cannot be ensured in the negative, till the voice of the people is heard in the Conference, or through the Press, as a temporary substitute, we hope, for the former.

Our next subject, No. 3, is the letter of "Junius," which appeared in the Globe, May 21. It is preceded by editorial remarks which will assist in convincing the public generally of the impropriety of the public interference of the Ministers of Religion, in the politics of the day.

By the impression made on the public mind generally, the Methodist body may perceive how they are rendered an object of intense public interest, through the interference of their preachers. It would not be difficult to refer to other portions of the Provincial Press representing other Churches, to show the anxiety with which the effect of Mr. Ryerson's writings on the members of the Methodist Church, was looked for. It is impossible, under such circumstances, that the members can avoid making themselves objectionable to one political party, in proportion as they give satisfaction to the other.

The consequence of the exercise of such an instrumentality would be really frightful in a religious point of view, and demands now the serious attention of the rulers of all the Churches in the Province. If they should run the race for political influence with the government, in which one Minister, has attempted more than once to start the Wesleyan Methodist Church, there would not only be an end to practical religion in the Province, but such a contention among the various denominations of Christians, as would result in the suppression of all but the strongest.

We ask the whole membership of the province, whatever their political opinions may be, whether, in contemplation of such results, they will submit to the direction of Conference, or the Christian Guardian, or to any individual Minister in the exercise of their civil privileges? We ask, also, is there any doubt that the object of the Rev. Egerton Ryerson's defence of Sir Charles Metcalfe was not so to influence them? Is not such interference on the part of either of the parties above mentioned, indicative of a preference in point of immediate importance, of politics to religion? Is it not destructive of the spiritual life, energy, and usefulness of the Ministry? If these questions can be satisfactorily answered in favour of the course of the Rev. Egerton Ryerson we shall be the first to rejoice that all our apprehensions are without foundation.

We come now to the letter signed Junius. The rumoured appointment of the Rev. E. Ryerson to the office of Deputy Superintendent of Education, was the occasion of calling forth the letter. It corroborates former statements, with reference to the widely extended and deeply rooted conviction, in the minds of the whole Methodist community,—and to some extent prevalent in general, that no other