

committal clauses as were employed by the editor of the *Guardian*. The former (Mr. Ryerson) says, "I have no intention either to explain or defend the present bill. The latter says, "It is not free from objections, and, strange to say, he claims, "some representation in the great Council of the University, by the appointing of two or more Professors from each College, yet opposes all Lay-representation in the Conference of his own denomination."

Our design in the foregoing, with reference to the course taken by the ostensible leaders of a large section of religious society in this Province, is to show that there is, in all this, a seeming want of any fixed principle of action—a destitution of Christian patriotism—an unwillingness to make common cause with all the true friends of equal rights and privileges, and a determination to drive for themselves and colleagues as hard a bargain as possible with the civil Government for emolument and power, even at the sacrifice of the liberties of their brethren. We are confirmed in this conviction by the fact, that the editor of the *Guardian* and one or two of his official friends in this City, who, after attending a meeting of various Ministers of religion, to get up a united memorial or representation of their views to Parliament, as to the defects of the University bill, and after having cordially expressed their agreement with the views of the party who met, did, notwithstanding, and without assigning any valid reason, refuse to sign the memorial. Where is the evidence, in all this, of a regard for equal rights and privileges? there is none whatever. The editor is, perhaps, right in the assertion, "that Methodists alone know how to promote the welfare of Methodism," but we are morally certain, that such conduct, on the part of its professed teachers, will not promote the welfare of Christianity—the interests of education—or the political prosperity of the country.

CHAPEL PROPERTY.

On a former occasion, we showed how the Chapel property of the Wesleyan Methodist Church would be affected in the event of another Union between that body and the British Conference. That it would most likely fix the whole of it in the permanent possession of the British Conference, so as to render a future dissolution impossible. Under these circumstances, we wish to impress on the minds of our readers, the influential members of the Church, to insist upon having a vote before they consent to another Union, and to secure in the event of a future separation, the property now belonging to the Wesleyan Methodist Church.

We have now an independent Church, and it is but fair, that before that independence is considered, that provision should be made for the restoration and full enjoyment of the property now in its possession, in circumstances *similia iuris*. However true it may be, that the parties who have subscribed for the building of the place of worship, have an inalienable claim to the property both moral and equitable, their legal claim, as we have seen on former occasions, is quite another question.

We make these remarks in consequence of an increased conviction that a Union is contemplated. In there should be no Union, and the present University Bill pass, the Wesleyan Methodist Church, in the position of a State Church to the exclusion of the body connected with the British Conference, a position which, we believe, the British Conference will not be disposed to consent to, if they can do otherwise.

We hear also, that on the event of a Union, it is part of the plan to dispense with the services of as many of the present preachers in the Union as they can, and equally to replace with missionaries from England. This arrangement will forever prevent a dissolution, should it be ever so desirable on the part of the people, as the new preachers would soon be members of the Conference, and so inseparably united to the British Conference, that it would be impossible that the Wesleyan Methodist Church should ever come out of such a union, into an independent existence, but in the form of a secession of lay-members. To those who think with us, that the existence of an independent Wesleyan Methodist Church, separated from State connection and independent of Government allowance is essential to religious prosperity, it is a question of the greatest importance to prevent the formation of another union, without taking necessary measures to provide for a case of dissolution, and the possession of the Chapel property to be secured to those who have every moral and equitable claim to it; but union or no union, there is no safety, but in an immediate alteration of the mode of settlement of the Chapel Property to the effect, that it must be so decided, that it cannot go out of the hands of the people without their consent.

We have offered many convincing reasons in support of Lay-representation, but that offered by this question is superior to all. The whole Wesleyan Methodist Church will be extinguished, if there be no Lay-representation.

In our March number, on the subject of the Missionary affairs of the Wesleyan Methodist Church, we discovered a very palpable error, which previous to publication was not detected. We hasten to correct it. We pointed out the false economy of allowing the six Chairmen £50 per annum each, instead of employing the 32 ordinary agents, who only

received £168. We omitted the word "prospectively" in reference to the £300 per annum, or rather "the current year," and afterwards added that the Missionary agent was paid in addition his £168 per annum, for the year last reported, thereby allowing it to be understood that both Chairman and Missionary Agent were to be continued. This mistake arose by confounding the past year with the current year, and was not at all intended. All that we intended to express was, that there was no economy in paying £300 per annum instead of £168. There was no intention of making the case worse than it is, and it does not answer our purpose to make any mis-representations, or to suffer an error to remain uncorrected.

DOINGS AT THE GUARDIAN OFFICE.

"Let all things be done decently and in order."—Paul.

We intimated more than once the character of the opposition which our paper receives from the Christian Guardian office. We by no means allude to the Editor of that paper, personally; as we cannot believe he would willingly be a party to such proceedings as we have to complain of. We had scarcely finished our remarks relative to the conduct of the managers of the Christian Guardian in sending as an enclosure to its country subscribers, a slanderous letter, attacking the private character of the Editor of this journal, than we find one or two official members perambulating the streets of the City requesting the signatures of members of the Church expressive of their disapprobation of our journal.

This inquisitorial proceeding is a disgrace to the Church, for the itinerant agitators when pressed are obliged to confess that they act without the authority of the Church; though it is known that they are the servile agents of the managers of the Christian Guardian.

The object of the paper thus getting up for public effect is only, as far as we know, expressive of disapprobation. This cannot be the real object of these inquisitorial visitors; by this means they are able to examine members individually, and judge of their opinions, that they may be regarded as parties; and no doubt, if it can be done, will be slandered or persecuted as the Editor of this journal has been. We hope they, at least, are satisfied with the result of their canvass through the outskirts of the City and ten miles beyond, for we find that out of a Quarterly meeting of about thirty-two, they have succeeded in procuring about seven or eight names some of whom are but little known, and have but recently joined the Church as official members, and easily overruled. One of whom has been named for the occasion an official member, being made a leader in opposition to the class to which he was appointed, and the expressed wish almost unanimously, of the Leader's Meeting.

But we have the most amusing part related, these valuable servants of the Conference obtained two names under false pretences, and when the persons thus imposed upon knew the real nature of the question, they demanded indignantly the suppression of their names. This was done, they were influential names, the only names of that character they had obtained, consequently the publication of the article in the *Guardian* with the list of names is postponed for a week, on the very good reason, that it could not appear to advantage.

From the *Globe*.

THE WESLEYAN METHODISTS.

We have received the following letter from a highly-respectable Methodist of this City, in reference to the phrase "Ryerson Methodists," which we applied, in our last number, to the body of Canadian Methodists.—

To the Editor of the *Globe*.

Toronto, 20th March, 1845.

Sir,—Your valuable and independent Journal on Tuesday last, in discussing the University Bill, now before Parliament, you have designated the members of the Wesleyan Church "Ryerson Methodists," and called the *Christian Guardian* their "organ." As there can be no doubt that you have fallen into these two errors, we want only of more accurate information, I hasten to correct them, to afford you an opportunity of doing so in your Journal.

The Methodist body contemplated to be provided for by the present University Bill is called the "Wesleyan Methodist Church," many hundreds of its members of which feel greatly mortified, and in some degree insulted, by being called "Ryerson Methodists." These repudiate his name, and refuse to be associated in his policy and that of the *Christian Guardian*, on the questions of the University and Clergy Reserves, and his correspondence in political affairs. Many of them are zealous supporters of your Journal, and of the principles expressed therein, in favour of a separation of all Christian Churches from State support and connection, which, perhaps, gives them a claim on you in requesting they may not be misrepresented.

With reference to the *Christian Guardian*. It is the organ of the Conference, or of the clergy only, and does not represent the opinions of the community, and with respect to the important questions relative to the Clergy Reserves and the University Bill, they are largely misrepresented in that Journal, consequently, an influential and numerous portion of the members of the Church have recently come forward to support a Journal which gives expression to their views on these subjects, as well as on others general. I refer you to the *Toronto Periodical Journal*, or *Wesleyan Methodist*, for full information on the subject.

I am, Sir, your obedient Servant,
A MEMBER OF THE WESLEYAN METHODIST CHURCH.

We would be extremely sorry to offend the feelings of any one, by applying names to them which they repudiate; and much less to persons holding the sound principles advocated by the "Periodical Journal." We cannot, however, see how any portion of the Methodist body can escape from the responsibility of being "Ryerson Methodists" in fact. That worthy person openly pledged

self to them for his mess of pottage, but we look in vain for the indignant protest against his proceedings, which truth and self-respect ought to have called up from the lay-members of the Church. We expected to have heard of meetings through the length and breadth of the land, proclaiming that the people repudiated the sentiments which Ryerson had dared to attribute to them. Instead of this, we find a portentous silence maintained.—Ryerson himself loaded with the highest honours of the Church, and sent to Europe as the Representative of the body; and, still further, we find the "Christian Guardian" controlled only by the Ministers—*ТРАСЪ СВОЮЮ*—but supported by the people—advocating lastly the very sentiments which Ryerson was purchased to maintain.

Why do the really liberal Methodists not speak out? Why do they *сидят* under cover? Are they ashamed of their opinions? If they are not, let them come out like men, and rally round the standard set up by themselves—"The Periodical Journal." We lately saw a most violent attack against this journal in the "Colonist," and we fully expected to see its next sheet filled with well known names, throwing back the slander with indignation, and vouching for the respectability of their journal. We always doubt a man who is not willing to put his opinions in "black and white."

From the *Globe*.

THE CHRISTIAN GUARDIAN AND THE BRITISH COLONIST. ANOTHER CASE OF COLLUSION.

Since writing the article connected with the same subject, which appears in this paper, we have had put into our hands the following letter; which, if true, and we have every reason to believe it is so, will certainly arouse the Methodist body to action.

We were quite prepared to learn, that the conductors of the *Guardian* were hand and glove with the *Colonist*, and decidedly hostile to the now journal; but we certainly did not think they would, in the dark, inflict a coward stab like this on an opponent. We sincerely trust, that there will be some explanation given of this black-looking transaction:—

To the Editor of the *Globe*.

"SIR,—You will doubtless recollect, that when Dr. Ryerson had almost finished his writings in defence of Sir Charles Metcalfe, published in the "Colonist" from time to time, that one number of that journal, containing what he called his appendix, and thought to be important, was sent to the subscribers of the "Christian Guardian," in the same package which contained the copies of the latter paper. The "Christian Guardian" being restrained by the highest authority in the Church from publishing those letters of Dr. Ryerson, a party having the management of it resorted to the disreputable mode herein described of forcing these writings on the attention of the members of their Church. An explanation was demanded, and an attempt was made on the part of the conductors of the "Guardian" to give one, but the affair was never fully explained. The scheme having succeeded so well, it cannot be surprising that it should be resorted to again; and the occasion for doing so arose from the following circumstance:—

The interference of Dr. Ryerson in political affairs, and the participation therein on the part of the leading Ministers of his Church, not being approved of by many members of the same Church, have brought into existence a public journal expressing the views of the latter, and advocating the necessity of subjecting the Ministers of that Church to some degree of control, so as to prevent their public interference in politics for the future. That journal has now been issued three months, and none of its serious charges relative to the organ of complaint have been replied to by the official organ of that body; instead of which honourable opposition a letter attacking the private character of the Editor of their opponent's journal, from an anonymous person under their influence, was inserted in the *Colonist* of the 11th inst. That letter though it touched upon one of the points in dispute, was laid before the readers of the *Colonist*, of whom, perhaps, not twenty are so familiar with the affairs of the Wesleyan Methodist Church as to render them interesting; and perhaps not three of them knew the individual thus attacked. So far, this act could have no rational object; but on the following weekly issue of the *Guardian*, the same letter was converted into an extra, and issued by the *Guardian*, placed within its folds, and sent to the country subscribers of that paper! The extra corresponds in respect to the type with that of the same article in the *Colonist*, and the heading "British Colonist" is retained; also, it is admitted by the managers of the *Guardian*, that they adopted this mode of opposing a journal, which they could not meet in a candid or honorable manner in their own journal, though it is published expressly to advocate and defend their institutions, and their interests as a body. I shall not refer to the contents of the letter thus circulated, with reference to the assertions it contains, only to say, that other means than the public papers will be resorted to, in vindicating private character. As far, only, Mr. Editor, as the subject of this communication is one of public concern, is your attention directed to it, with reference to its insertion in your columns. Consequently, our object I have in view is, to show how such conduct, on the part of the managers of public journals, degrades the press, which, if not exposed, may be so repeated and imitated, as to bring contempt on the press of Upper Canada, and to demoralize the community. It is to be expected that the *Globe* will publish a just and appropriate criticism on the subject of such clandestine collusions.

Another object I have in view, is to hold up to public reprobation the conduct of Editors who insert articles which attack private character, and who refuse to allow the person attacked to reply in the journal which is made the instrument of that attack.

Such was the conduct of the *Colonist* in the case in question aggravated by the circumstance of collusive arrangement with the *Guardian*, in making the use of the article as described.

Worse than this seems to be the conduct of the latter journal. A mighty body, a wide conference of ministers, by their managing agents, resort to this clandestine mode of attacking one insignificant individual, reducing private character, when there is no question in dispute between the parties, but a public one, between the Conference and a large portion of its members of their church. Further, they adopt this mode of attack to take shelter from the operation of their own ecclesiastical laws, against evil-speaking; for they knew that they could not publish the anonymous letter in their own columns with impunity.

I am, &c.

JUSTICE.

We thankfully acknowledge the respectful notice taken of our last number, by the editors of the "Canada Christianianity."