

And with respect to the charge of falsehood brought by the Editor of the *Guardian* against the Toronto *Periodical Journal*, I claim a small extension of indulgence, Mr. Editor, in making a few remarks, as you will admit that it is a public question. If a portion of the inhabitants of Canada, amounting by the *Guardian's* estimate on the University Question to about 120,000, is under the spiritual and moral guardianship of the Wesleyan Methodist Ministry, it is a public question of the greatest importance, whether a few of the ruling members of that ministry are guilty or not guilty of the charges brought against their public conduct, as they have it in their power to raise or lower the standard of morality among 121,000 people, whose influence on the whole Province will be in proportion to their numbers. If the Toronto *Periodical Journal* has asserted what is false, the Editor, and all that support it, ought to be execrated by the whole Province. If, on the contrary, it has declared what is strictly true, is it enough, Mr. Editor, for the *Christian Guardian* to be satisfied by saying to the public "the hired scribe writes all kinds of slander, because he is hired to do so. We have refrained from taking notice of this paper till now because its authorship was unworthy of notice. We have nothing to do with the hired writer. He is nothing to us. Let him repent his falsehoods times without number, and add as many more to what he has already written, no motive sufficient would arise for noticing the reckless utterer, or his baseless or slanderous utterings." And again—"We have not declined writing because what is written cannot be answered, but because the responsible parties are unknown to us." I contend Sir, that the question has become a public one, and it is not at the option of the Editor of the *Guardian* any longer to refuse answering to what is written in the Toronto *Periodical Journal*. I demand it as an official member of the Church; thousands demand it, and the public in general demands it.

The ruling portion of the Conference are charged with saying that at a suitable time they would put out their feeler and support that political party which would give them most. If this can be disproved, why is it not disproved? Dr. Ryerson is charged with political corruption in the highest degree, and they with participating with him. Why do they employ him and share in the reward of his political prostitution? They are charged with knowingly sending out an immoral preacher. If it is false why do they not proceed to clear themselves? They are charged with designing to remove from the Conference several valuable, pious and laborious members, and with a misappropriation of the Missionary funds: all of which they say are falsehoods and easily answered. Why not answer them, and relieve themselves from these imputations? They are not merely personally concerned, but virtually trustees for their successors and the succeeding generation of the Church; consequently, they have no right to refuse answers which they say they can so easily give. Under shelter of their refusal, they may now be corrupting the institutions of Methodism beyond remedy. The Editor of the *Guardian* says it is easy to answer the so-called falsehoods of the Toronto *Periodical Journal*, why then should he take so much more pains to avoid doing so? To avoid answering the charges which he says it is so easy to do, he incurs the moral guilt of evil speaking, of falsehood and extreme personal slander—and employs itinerant agents to go through the city and country for ten miles beyond to obtain signatures condemnatory of the so-called slanderous journal; he prolongs agitation on the question throughout the Province, while he withholds his easy answers. Will any one of common sense believe he can do this easy thing, while he refuses, labouring and floundering under the difficulty of a hard one? The inference is irresistible, he cannot refute the charges brought against certain parties by the Toronto *Periodical Journal*.

The Editor of the *Guardian* admits that "to diminish public confidence is to lessen the success of the Ministry;" and that "Methodism can only succeed so long as confidence is begot and kept up in the public mind."

By easily answering these charges, the journal issuing them is suppressed, by its losing the confidence of the people which it now seems to have.

I have read that journal, and noticed the several charges made by it, and that the writer asserts that he is provided with proofs of every thing that he asserts. If, after this, the rulers of the church will not vindicate themselves, it is high time that the people took that business in hand. Whether these charges are true or false, must now soon be known. The question to be decided is not whether the editor of the *Periodical Journal* is paid or not paid,—whether he is a member of the church or not,—whether he is black or white; but whether what he asserts is true or false. As to his private character, the presumption that it is not very assailable is strengthened by the fact of his association with the most respectable and influential members of the church; and that none of his assertions have been disproved.

I will only make one more remark. The Editor of the *Guardian* says, "Whether he (Mr. Ryerson) was right or wrong in so doing, it is not for us to say." Is this the expression of a modest distrust of his own judgment, or a tacit admission of unwillingness to decide that Dr. Ryerson was wrong—and equivalent to a declaration that he was right? This question is decided by a reading of the part of the *Guardian*, to condemn the paper that opposes Dr. Ryerson's con-

duct, equal to his reluctance to condemn that individual. As it is evident that one question involves the other, when the *Guardian* says, "That the publication is a wrong step," he consequently admits that Doctor Ryerson was right; and as Editor of the Conference organ, he also commits his employers to that admission.

I am, Sir,

Your obedient servant,

AN OFFICIAL MEMBER OF THE WESLEYAN-METHODIST CHURCH, OF THE TORONTO CITY CIRCUIT.

The "*Christian Guardian*" condemns the Principle upon which the Methodist Church is governed.—We regret, that for want of space this month, we are not able to enter at length into the subject of an Editorial article of the *Christian Guardian*, of the 23rd ultimo. It refers to the Edinburgh Review, of January last, in which the life and correspondence of that remarkable and once promising light in the literary world, the late Dr. Arnold, is reviewed. The *Christian Guardian* assents to divisions and subdivisions in churches and nations; and admits the principles of democracy and party government, which Dr. Ryerson has so recently condemned. All that we can do at present is, to claim, on his part, the practical application of the principles he avows, and promise to take up the subject fully in our next number.

#### TO OUR SUBSCRIBERS.

We have, in the course of the last month, received several additional letters from various parts of the Province, expressive of the opinions of the members of our Church in relation to our Journal,—of its reception by its opposers, and its treatment by its opponents. Some of these we give at length; of others we can only give extracts. The following letter ably shows the impropriety of turning the attention of the members of the Church to the personal character of the Editor of this Journal, rather than to answering his statements:—

To the Editor of the Toronto *Periodical Journal*.

DEAR SIR,—Upon opening the *Christian Guardian*, of the 19th instant, I found enclosed therein an article entitled "The Toronto *Periodical Journal* and Wesleyan Methodism," issued (professedly) from the British Colonist press, and presented to the public under the imposing title of "Truth." The object of this communication I understand to be, to caution the Methodist community, in particular, against countenancing "a certain *Periodical Journal*, the third number of which is now before the public." The author asserts, that "a mere glance at the successive numbers of the Journal, as they have appeared, cannot fail to satisfy all candid readers of the real character of the movement, and securing them against imbibing the same ruthless spirit." The "numbers" of the said "Journal" have received more than "a mere glance," having been opened with interest and care by a large portion of the Methodist community. All such "candid readers" are perfectly satisfied with the real character of the movement; but whether the perusal of these numbers has had the effect to "secure them against imbibing the same ruthless spirit" is, in my mind, a question, the majority of them regarding this "ruthless spirit" as none other than a spirit of primitive Christianity—a spirit of zeal for, and a holy devotedness to the "purity, efficiency, and unity" of the Wesleyan Methodist Church; and, regarding it as such, they are drinking deeply into the same spirit; and I am somewhat apprehensive that the present attempt even of "Truth" will fail to "secure them against imbibing it."

As an individual, I am glad to hear anything said by those who are not friendly to the "*Periodical Journal*." It proves that they feel something on the subject, though disposed, for so long a time, to pass it by in silence. But I am exceedingly sorry to find myself forced to the conclusion that "Truth," since it has spoken, cannot advance anything more substantial and effective, with which to support itself, than it has done in the present attempt, and, consequently, has to make use of such means as have been resorted to. I sincerely hope, for "Truth's" sake, that it may yet apper that the communication has assumed a wrong signature, though this would not be desirable, in one sense, because the character of the author is concerned; but, being a lover of truth and considering the establishment of it very important, I would rejoice to see it stand upon a better foundation than it is made to have in the communication under consideration. I fear that "Truth" (if by "truth" we are to understand that principle generally recognised among men under this title) has debased itself: pure, genuine truth is designed to accomplish noble ends, by noble means; but whatever is the purpose to be effected in this instance, the means used are anything but noble. Only give truth the high position assigned it by all, and how low

must he stoop to use such means, to accomplish any end, as those which have been resorted to in the present instance. It must be another ray of light, and different from anything that has ever shone before, which gives such an unnatural view of things as this.

The "*Periodical Journal*," makes assertions and assumes positions, involving important interests, and having a direct and important bearing upon the "Wesleyan Methodists in Canada." Many of the members of said Church, have read the assertions and examined the positions assumed; and concurring testimony convinces them of the truth of what is advanced through the medium of its columns, respecting the present state of the Church, and the increasingly great importance of attaining, if possible, the proposed object of the "*Periodical*." They have been anxiously looking for arguments from the opposite side, but have looked in vain, until the present article appeared, and now, I could ask what has it done? We might expect much, when we remember what is speaking, but what single fact is brought to view, having any bearing upon the subject? In my opinion it is wide of the mark, and so far from accomplishing the object for which this bold attempt has been made, it only serves to strengthen the positions assumed by those who conduct the "*Periodical Journal*." It is a natural supposition, that in attempting to prevent the spreading and imbibing of this "ruthless spirit," the very best arguments would be used, and an effectual blow levelled at the existing evil; and if this has been done, and "Truth," can advance nothing better in support of its cause, it is evident that its cause is not a good one.

In the present "movement," what have the Methodist community to do with the private character of any individual, or how does it concern them to know what employment occupies any individuals? But they are directly concerned in what has been advanced in the "*Periodical Journal*," because it affects the Church of which they are members, and it is either truth or falsehood, and it is by no means unimportant for Methodists to know which. If what has been brought before the public in the "*Periodical*," is not truth, why is it not met in an open, free, and candid manner? If the positions are not good, not based upon truth, why is this not shown by an observing public? If the arguments used to sustain those positions are not sound, why are they not refuted by those that are sound, being founded on principles of reason and truth? If the object at which the "*Periodical*" aims, is not scriptural, why is this not made to appear? Or if what has been advanced is truth, why do those of the opposite party seek to evade it, by placing a private individual in such an unenviable light as has been attempted? Is not such conduct, a libel upon "Truth," The only just inference, as I can conceive that can be drawn from the premises given, is, that the subject can be met in no better way, by those who meet it thus; this is the impression that must remain upon the mind of the public, until, it is met by fair, cool, deliberate convincing argument. I would now briefly refer to some of "the facts," advanced by "Truth" at the conclusion of his communication, and from which it is affirmed "some idea of the true character of the agitating movement," is to be gained. The first is, "that it is wholly anonymous." It seems to me a little strange, that it never occurred to "Truth," that there may exist good and sufficient reasons, why those engaged in this "movement," should feel disposed to come before the public, as anonymous individuals. But where is the consistency of assuming such a position as this, to condemn for being guilty in this particular, and which "in the very act" of condemning, to be guilty of the same? It would perhaps be well to remind "Truth," that wherein he judges another, he condemns himself. If this fact proves anything, I am apprehensive it proves too much, for if this consideration is sufficient to deter individuals from approving of "the agitating movement," it is also sufficient to doom his own article to be treated with silent contempt. Another fact noticed is, "that the "*Periodical Journal*," is published by Alfred Carter." Now, wherever the publisher may be, what has been written touching the subject to which the "*Periodical*" is devoted, has been advanced in a spirit and manner, worthy of imitation, and (in my estimation,) much more in keeping with the Christian character, than that which is seen to pervade this production of "Truth." Another fact, "that it is not known that a single member of the Wesleyan Church in Toronto, is connected with it," and I would ask, what of all this? There may be Methodists of other parts as well as in Toronto connected with it, and this not be known to every body; and if not, what then? I assume, that if individuals who are not Methodists, bring forward truths important for Methodists to know, truths having a direct reference to, and important bearing upon the interests of their Church, they justly claim from Methodists gratitude. Another fact is noticed, respecting the Church, of the "few whom suspicion leads as to its patronage and support." I would merely say, in reply to this, that it is a fact of small importance; the known truths advanced, are too lame to support "Truth," and I am sure these suspicions must do less.

I conclude, by expressing an earnest wish, that if "Truth" is disposed to speak again on this subject, it will speak in character, that it will come before us