

ed him in the Conference Chamber, were too much for his moral prowess as well as many of his colleagues. The circumstances attending the drawing up of that memorial, render such a construction of his conduct inevitable. He was present when it was adopted—he truly concurred in it—he not only concurred in it, but pressed upon the brethren present to make it clear and firm in its tone—he told them he was determined to take a strong position, that he would occupy strong grounds against Mr. Ryerson in Conference. Yet, after all this, the memorial was not presented, the strong grounds were not taken.

Let every member of the body inquire the reason why Mr. Ryerson, the grand political diplomatist to the Conference of the Wesleyan Methodist Church in Canada, bearded the members on the floor of Conference, and gave them to understand "the *two which bound him to the body were slender indeed*," meaning evidently, that it he were not sustained by that body (politically,) he would leave the Conference. The Conference could not want his influence at Government House, therefore he was sustained,—hence the non-presentation of the memorial. The admission to Mr. Wilkinson in the letter to which I have referred, led him at once to address a letter to the publisher of the *Globe*, in which instead of denying or disproving any of my statements, he at once denounced me as an "anonymous slanderer," and my letter as a "very vulnerable, faulty, and slanderous production." Such a mode of correcting an official error, or of redressing an injury inflicted upon many of his Christian brethren appeared to me altogether incompatible with the character and office which he sustains. By this time, the public began to feel a deep interest in the case, particularly many Methodist Societies throughout the country, and many sermons were abated regarding the evasive and very unsatisfactory reply given by Mr. Wilkinson, when the President himself, knowing that matters could not long remain in this way, addressed a long communication to the *Guardian*, in which, with many useful remarks, he protested against the right of any private member of the Church, communicating upon any of their (the Preachers) proceedings through the Press. I rejoice that this is a right of which we cannot lawfully be deprived, and it is one of inestimable value, when delegated authority assumes a proud and heartless supremacy over a community, and when it prostitutes its powers to establish its own interests at the expense of the temporal or spiritual prosperity and happiness of man. After the appearance of the President's letter, my reply of the 13th November, appeared in the columns of your journal, and like its predecessor, was again answered officially by the Secretary of Conference,—perhaps by the command of the President himself.

Mr. Wilkinson, in his reply, as I have already stated, has pronounced my last "as a whole, a tissue of shameful misstatements and untruths, but still professedly condescended to touch, as he terms it, the foul thing of Nov. 13th." Reserving his own figure, I hope no man yet be able to come out of this scrutiny of his own and the public conduct of his colleagues with *clean hands and a pure heart*, but as yet he has not fully met a single item of the charges embodied in that communication. The Secretary of Conference wishes to be distinctly understood that he is a competent witness as to the various transactions referred to in my last letter, while he affirms that his "claims to sincerity and veracity he will surrender to no man." I have no desire, sir, to single out the official Secretary to whom, individually, I owe no allegiance, but I doubtfully inquire, is the *Rev'd interested Secretary* a competent witness in the premises? Will he fearlessly aver that he was present during the whole sittings of the Book Committee Meetings held in Toronto for the past four months? This is essential to the establishment of his testimony. If he were not, my testimony rests upon evidence equally credible with his own.—If he was there on the occasions referred to, let him manfully and openly declare what did occur. Can the Secretary explain what conversation took place between Doctor Ryerson and as many members of the Book Committee as were present, when a member was obliged to reply to a certain threat from the modest Doctor, "Brother Ryerson, you will get over this pet before you cross the water,—before you reach England!!" Can the official Secretary consistently explain also, how many members of the Conference Executive Committee were present, and at what time, when a proposition was made, previous to the above transaction, to speak favourably of Dr. Ryerson through the Press, or, in other words, to give him a puff direct in the *Christian Guardian* previous to his departure for England? Is he not aware that this was subsequently done, and that his name was introduced and eulogized in that journal as "a respected minister, the Principal of Victoria College, &c., &c.?" But the Book Committee and the Editor of the *Guardian*, knowing or fearing that such a public expression of approbation of Mr. Ryerson, at that time, would have excited the suspicion of the whole Methodist people, that were were political influences at work bearing upon the leading preachers through the Doctor; the name of a truly respected Minister was associated with his name, apparently to ward off such suspicion; and on a transgression being made against the associating of the name of this individual with Mr. Ryerson, the degrading confession was made by a

Brother, we only made you the cloth by which to catch the hot iron" (meaning the Doctor). This humiliating acknowledgment which had obtained very general currency amongst the Methodist friends, and doubtless having reached the ears of the Doctor himself, he was indignant at the import of the simile employed, and seemed determined to bring his colleagues to terms, hence we easily solve the threat made by him that, unless supported by conference, he would not advocate the claims of the body in England." The above narration of circumstances, I give, by way of evidence, to refresh the memory or to enlighten the judgment of the official Secretary, Mr. Wilkinson. I may remark here, that, in his reply to my letter, his allusion to the above threat, made by Mr. Ryerson, and to no counsel given by the Doctor to some of the leading Preachers, that "if the Preachers would only do their duty, his writings would have their desired political effect," he manifestly evades the stern reality presented before him. Why does the Secretary take so much exception and demand proof on mere matter of words and phraseology? He knows full well that it is with the ideas conveyed by the words—the sentiments which were expressed by them—not the words themselves he has to do. As a man that declares he will not yield his claim to sincerity and veracity to any one (supposing from his own remarks upon the subject, in his letter, that he was really present when the conversation occurred,) I dare him to deny the fact that language similar to that which was quoted by him from my former letter was employed at a certain meeting of the Book Committee, and that it did essentially convey the ideas or sentiments expressed by that language.

Referring to the inferences which had been drawn by the Methodist body generally, from the silence which the leading preachers had maintained, Mr. Wilkinson remarks that "the unbearable use made of the course which had thus been adopted, as he says, (by him at least,) in the fear of God, as the best on the whole," led him to change his views of duty, and to come out with his reply. In doing so, he remarks, with reference to the construction which had been put upon his previous silence, "I prayerfully conceive it relieves me of all responsibility as to the result of a plain statement of facts." From the language of the Secretary, one would suppose that he was about to take a strong position, and to occupy "strong grounds" by meeting the charges fairly and fairly; but I appeal to every unprejudiced and intelligent mind, whether his statement of facts, as he calls it, amounts to anything more than a mere play upon words—a denial only of an assumed phraseology. He promised, however, I shall honour them (the facts I had alleged) with rather more than a single denial now my hand is in," assuming, one would suppose, that he was about triumphantly to demonstrate the untruth, at least, of two points, which, with much pride, he had selected for his special criticism. I regret, exceedingly, Mr. Editor, that while the hand of the official Secretary was in about the foul thing of Nov. 13th," as he terms it, he did not finish the task he had begun, because he had not then touched the path or marrow of the subject, or that part of it, at least, which lay nearest to himself. In my former communication, I stated, in proof of the unallowable political scheming of some of our leading preachers, that, on a certain occasion, one of them made the degrading confession that "we (the Methodists) are able to tam the Elections at any time between the contending parties, and that before the Elections come on, we will put out our FELLER, and the party who will take us up, or give us the most, shall have our support." Now Mr. Wilkinson states, with reference to that communication, "as a whole I fearlessly pronounce it to be a tissue of shameful misstatements, misrepresentations, and untruths," and he would have the public to infer that reasons of a wise and pure character, led him and his colleagues to stand aloof from a newspaper controversy with the author of it. Not only so, but he assures your readers, that that course, as far as he was concerned, was adopted in the fear of God, as the best on the whole, and involved no hide self-denial and forbearance on his part. Besides all this, as if impelled by a high sense of duty to inflict a merited coup de grace upon the writer of that alleged calumny, he remarks, "I prayerfully conceive that it (the construction put upon his silence) relieves me from the results of a plain statement of facts."—The man that hath done this thing shall surely die," then follows his defence. In my former communication I referred to the necessity which existed, in the time of the Saviour, of communicating truth to the teachers of that day under the language of simile, and it would seem to be not the less imperative now. I, therefore, instead of denouncing his statements in the manner he has done mine, would request him—prayerfully, and in the fear of God, to ponder the instruction given to the King of Israel, after he had grievously sinned, under a parable delivered before him by the prophet Nathan, and I call upon the official Secretary, as a preacher of righteousness, to retract his shameful denunciation of my statements, since at the mouth of more than two or three witnesses, every word concerning this item of political ingratitude can be established,—and the others, I have reason to believe, rest upon grounds equally sure.

Now, Sir, as an independent editor of a public journal, I cannot but state, before you and

the public. If correct, the language employed—the denunciation of the official Secretary against me, although unbecoming, is at least just, and I freely acknowledge that I deserve to be expelled, and no longer to hold a name in a Christian Church, without making those open and sincere acknowledgments indicative of sincere repentance for so flagrant a transgression. But, if true, how will the Secretary reconcile his language of denunciation against me, with that propriety and transparency of character which should belong to the Christian, but particularly to the teachers of our holy religion? How can he defend the political plotting of the Book Committee—the Executive Committee of Conference? As for myself, I freely forgive the too hasty and irritable temper shown by him throughout all his communications with me. The Secretary and his colleagues are equally, with others, the subjects of human weakness and temptation, and while this fact should secure from their Christian brethren a consistent degree of charity and forbearance towards them, it especially presses upon the membership of the Church, the imperative necessity of maintaining at all times a salutary, scriptural check upon all the proceedings of their Preachers, whether in or out of conference. But, Mr. Editor, explanations of the discrepancies to which I have alluded are required. The Junior Preachers, who are not in the secrets of the Book Committee, demand that they should be made. The official members and the Lay brethren throughout Canada West demand them.—the Press, which guards the civil and religious liberties of the people, demands a clear and satisfactory explanation. The manner and time of doing this, I leave to the official members of the Book Committee. In view of the whole career of that "wandering star" in the heavens of Methodism in Canada, Dr. Ryerson, and those who have through ignorance or infirmity, yielded to his base political machinations, the heart of the sincere and humble Christian—the lover of truth, of purity, and peace, recoils with mingled pity and disgust. I might, Sir, recount scenes and circumstances of past years, relative to the combined political movements of certain members of our Conference, which were calculated to make religion itself a bye-word and a reproach in the world. I will not, however, trespass on your columns, but I may, on behalf of the whole Membership of the Methodist Church, ask the leading preachers in connection, why Conference proceedings are so generally conducted with closed doors?—do the interests of our Holy religion demand or require such secrecy on the part of its teachers or friends? The very reverse is the fact. It is the religion of light as well as love. But the interests of unholy power, of selfishness, of political intrigue, both demand and require darkness and secrecy. Let me ask our leading men why the late Editor of the *Guardian* was displaced to make way for an individual manifestly his inferior as to intellectual and literary qualifications? Did not Mr. Ryerson single out Mr. Playter as more suited to subvert his purposes than Mr. Scott? Did not Mr. Playter declare that he would sit down and cease his ordinary labours as a Minister of Christ, if not appointed to the office? Did not the right hand friend of Mr. Ryerson (Mr. McNab) go privately through the Conference-room, impressing on the minds of the junior preachers the importance and necessity of a change in the literary character of the *Guardian*, while in reality, the design was to get rid of Mr. Scott, whose uncompromising integrity had been a bar to the late political schemes of Mr. Ryerson and his friends? And, moreover, let me ask the official Secretary, whether it is not a fact which can be established by the most indubitable evidence, that THE PASTORAL ADDRESS, issued during the last sitting of Conference, and in which the Methodist people were enjoined to abstain from political agitation, was drawn up by Mr. RYERSON HIMSELF, the greatest and most inconsistent political agitator in the whole country? How, Sir, could such conduct be reconciled with the professed repudiation of the political career of that unhappy man by the members of the body? Perhaps the same reason which led the official Secretary to keep the Toronto memorial in his pocket when he went to Conference will account for this.—the same reasons which led him to denounce the UNIVERSITY BILL of the late Ministry as a *CESS*, after it had received the general approbation of the people, and even of the Conference itself—the same reasons which led Dr. Ryerson, after he had written to his Brother John (the then President of Conference) his intention of coming out in defence of the BALDWIN ADMINISTRATION, to come out in defence of Sir C. Metcalfe. And what were those reasons, Mr. Editor? Ah, Sir, I am almost ashamed to speak of those things which were done by them in secret,—those unfruitful works of darkness,—but Truth and Righteousness demand their exposure. "THE FELLER,"—yes, Sir, THE FELLER,—which had been put out, had come in contact with the "princely liberality" of Mr. Ryerson had taken "strong grounds" on the floor of Conference, having his hooks well baited with Executive favours in prospect,—the temptation was very strong,—the preachers were but men—mortal men—the leaders yielded to the political influence of the Government,—they hired themselves out to work political iniquity. That our leading Ministers have long had an eye to a Government provision, and almost on every political occasion have barely and