

to the teaching of the Son of God, "Call no man master upon earth, for one is your master, even Christ," "Call no man Father upon earth, for one is your Father, who is in Heaven." This diffused despotism was abhorrent even to the more enlightened among the preachers trained under Mr. Wesley. Dr. Coke remarks, in a letter to a preacher, dated Angerim, 20th April, 1795:—"Hitherto, we have seen, since the death of Mr. Wesley, the most perfect 'SPIRITUAL ARISTOCRACY' existing perhaps in the earth. 'The people have no power,—we, the whole, in the fullest sense which can be conceived. If there be 'any change in favour of religious liberty, the people should certainly have some power.'" This sentiment was penned about 50 years ago, by Dr. Coke, and is only giving utterance, verily, to a principle written, as with a sunbeam, in the New Testament, viz:—that the will of the community should regulate the body. Yet the Conference in this Province, is, according to the present organization, "the most perfect spiritual aristocracy, existing perhaps on the earth." It embraces about 90 members, all self-elected, who exercise supreme, legislative, executive, and financial authority over congregations numbering from 20,000 to 25,000 souls, who have scarcely any check whatever upon its power. It enacts and repeals laws and ordinances without reference to the will of the thousands which are to be the subjects of them: it exalts and abases individuals at its pleasure: it opens or shuts the door of admission to the congregations: it sues, from the dread of its power, or the terror of expulsion from the Church, all enquiry by the membership into the scriptural warrant for its constitution and power: it debars effectually, by its arrangements, all investigations into the abuses of its power: and in the face of the ingenuous frankness which the Gospel teaches,—in the face of the announcement of the Great Teacher, "I spoke openly to the world; I ever taught in the synagogue and in the temple, whither the Jews always resort, and in secret have I said nothing." It conducts its proceedings in perfect keeping with its usurped power—with closed doors and in the darkness of Inquisition secrecy. And, Mr. Editor if I may remind you, though you must know it well, who these men are. I say it not disparagingly with reference to one of them personally, that they are men from amongst our lives, a few months or years since—members of our classes under those who are still leaders, teachers in our Sabbath schools, and local preachers, earning with their own hands as we do, the necessaries of life—not a set of persons set apart by education and qualified for the province of government. Hence our troubles; they forsake the simple ministrations of the word of life for which they are, or were qualified, to rule in the church, to meddle with politics, to treat with the Government, and to assume power for which they have no more qualification than they have none.

These, Mr. Editor, are facts too well known throughout the membership, and we have unwisely and tamely submitted to the unscriptural tyranny thus exercised over us by the "Lords" of Conference, until we have made ourselves a bye word and reproach among all who value the great principles of civil and religious freedom. The time, however, draws rapidly upon us, when a change must, and will be effected—a change to be effected by the weapons of this Christian warfare, and which are "mighty through God, to the pulling down of strong holds." The members of Conference may, for a while, shut their eyes lest they may not see, and stop their ears lest they may not hear; they may profess not to discern the signs of the times, but with infuriated tenacity maintain for a season their usurped power;—yet, Sir, the day of decision or retribution will come, and your valuable periodical is preparing the way for it, when the people of God in all our Churches, shall be freed from Conference bondage, and "walking in the fear of God and in the comforts of the Holy Ghost, shall be multiplied." To submit at once to a lay-representation to an extent equal, at least, to the number of Ministers, may calm the minds of the brethren, and restore confidence new, but a resistance so offered and prolonged to this most righteous, equitable, and scriptural demand another remedy may be found for the evils and which we labour, in raising a new question,—that of the independence of Methodist congregations.

in accordance with New Testament authority, compatible with our doctrines and local usages as a people, & affording an entire deliverance from the calamities which have so long afflicted the connexion.

I am, Sir,

Your obedient servant,
VERITAS.

From the Globe.

THE PERIODICAL JOURNAL versus THE CHRISTIAN GUARDIAN.

To the Editor of the Globe.

Toronto, April 5, 1845.

SIR,—I notice in the *Christian Guardian* of the 2nd inst., a virulent attack on you, as I suppose, in consequence of the insertion of my letter in your journal of the 25th ult., and your remarks on the occasion; and also that the same number of the *Guardian* contains another article misrepresenting the opinions of a large majority of the members of the Wesleyan Methodist Church on an important question. I therefore beg the favour of an insertion of the following, the object of which, in the first place, is to assure you that "the whole body of the Wesleyan Methodists in Upper Canada" do not take your remarks as an insult to them, as the *Guardian* has asserted, but as a just advocacy of their liberties in denouncing the political profligacy of Dr. Ryerson, and as a valuable service on your part, showing that his conduct is participated in by the rulers of the Wesleyan Methodist Church, to the present moment, and secondly, to furnish you with additional information with regard to the state of public opinion among the members of the Wesleyan Methodist Church, on the political position which the rulers of that Church have taken—and in which without reason, they assume that they are supported by the whole body of Methodists in Upper Canada.

In the *Christian Guardian* of the 2nd inst., the extent of support or repudiation of the *Toronto Periodical Journal* is chosen as the criterion for deciding on the strength of public opinion in support of, or, in opposition to Dr. Ryerson's proceedings, and of those who sustain him in them. There is an approach to accuracy on the part of the Editor of the *Guardian* when he says, "The paper mentioned in the document has for its foundation the political struggle at the last general election." That struggle was only an incident; more correctly, that foundation was the systematic and deliberate interfering publicly in politics, by Dr. Ryerson, and the ruling portion of the ministers of our church, for the purpose of using the whole community for political objects. The election of a general election are temporary, and might be soon forgotten, if there was any objectionable interference on the part of the Clergy in politics. But the object of complaint is, that the church has become identified with politics. The *Journal* so contemptuously treated by the *Christian Guardian*, advocates the opinions of a vast majority of the church. It has become the people's organ, in relation to the cause to which its origin is attributed by the *Christian Guardian*, and its motto is, *Methodism as it was*. As it was, before politics became the chief occupation of some of its ministers; and before Dr. Ryerson knew any thing about it,—when, under its revered founder Wesley, both he and every one of its preachers could say with a clear conscience, "God forbid that I should know any thing among you, save Christ Jesus, and him crucified;" on which purity all its excellency and efficiency consists, either in England or elsewhere; and in which, alone, it has any ground for glorying in the hoary honours of a century. On the contrary, with reference to the plausible and delusive sentiment, *Methodism as it is*, which, if candour and honesty is intended, must mean, as it is in Canada, and under the Conference of the Wesleyan Methodist Church, few will be deceived in Toronto, as I have no doubt of being able to show.

The *Christian Guardian*, in order to make an impression on the public mind, that the whole body of Methodists sustain Mr. Ryerson in his political course, has given the names of twelve persons, official members of the church, under a declaration of repudiation of the *Toronto Periodical Journal*, which declaration it is admitted is called forth by the prevalence of a very general impression that most, if not all, of the brethren of the *Toronto Station*, are identified with the unwholesome journal. It is, therefore, natural to ask, what steps have been taken to disabuse the public mind on the question? Of course we expect to find in the *Christian Guardian* the signatures of a majority of the official members. This is the tendency of the *Guardian's* remarks on the subject, when he exhibits the twelve as an example to the whole community, and who have, in his opinion, immortalized their names, in the annals of Canadian Methodism.

We should have thought that the Editor of the *Guardian* would have satisfied himself as to the effect of the publication of these names, before they had so presumptuously set a feeble minority of the Church in the forefront of the battle, who, after the example of Gideon, could dispense with the bulk of his army, or, more presumptuously still, set up another twelve for immortality in the history of the Christian Church. But he has neither produced a majority of the official members nor an unwarlike and conquering minority. In spite of his twelve, the impression admitted by

These 12 names inserted below, are not noticed with any view to hurt the feelings of my brethren, or to depreciate their worthiness as members of the Church; but in order to demonstrate a fact, that they are only a feeble minority of the official members of the Church. Further, with reference to these persons, five of them have only held an official station within the last few months and subsequent to the occurrences which occasioned the present agitation in the Church,—consequently there are only seven persons on that list who were official members of the Church at the time referred to.

Though the *Guardian* takes credit for twenty-one, he only produces twelve names: while, from the eagerness displayed to obtain these—from the ostentatious use of them—and from the fact, that they were not voluntarily given, but obtained by personal application to each,—it is evident that others would have been added if they could have got them.

The other nine so artfully mentioned after the twenty-one are announced, though it is impossible not to perceive they are the nine whose names could not be obtained, and are included in the twenty-one, leaving him only twelve, which, on examination, are reduced to seven, and which is the whole effective force he can produce to decide the question, whether the majority of the official members of the Toronto City Station, have sanctioned the declaration which condemns the *Toronto Periodical Journal*.

To decide this question, I subjoin the names of the official members of the Church in Toronto, who have not signed the condemnatory declaration against the *Toronto Periodical Journal*, and who, I may add, will not sign it; some, because they believe that the Methodist body ought to have a Journal advocating their opinions; and some, because they wish to see whether the charges made in it are true or false, before they condemn it.

The following are the names of those who have not signed the condemnatory declaration against the *Toronto Periodical Journal*:—

John Doel, Robert James, Sheldon Ward, John Tyner, George H. White, Wm. Hamilton, George Rowell, John Doel, Junr., R. H. Brett, Geo. Shaver, Peter Shaver, James Dolson, James Tyner, Wm. Needham, D. Falconer, Wm. Haycock, J. Foster, Joshua Crawford, and Thomas Cuttell.

The following is the list of signatures obtained in condemnation of the same journal, as copied from the *Christian Guardian*:—

James Hodson, James Stephens, George Walker, Matthew Swan, Robert Craig, Wm. Clarkson, Thos. Stansfield, John Gline, John Cook, Wm. Tambllyn, Jonathan Cook, and Bartholomew Bull.

From this, it appears, there are nineteen names of the most influential of the official body, to set against the twelve given by the Editor of the *Guardian*; only one can be taken out as a recent addition to the official body since the commencement of the present agitation, while three might be added of the oldest and most influential of the Church who have retired from the official body, in disgust at the conduct of Dr. Ryerson, and those who support him.

Not adding these three, which might be done with more propriety than the *Guardian* adds nine, for he has no authority whatever for so doing, and taking off one as a recent addition, there are eighteen against seven of the official body, who have not signed the declaration against the *Toronto Periodical Journal*; and those eighteen, are undeniably the really influential portion, the stability of the Church in Toronto. It follows, that the statements of the *Guardian* are altogether fallacious—that the twelve he so confidently relies upon, no more represent the Wesleyan Church in Toronto, than they do the City of Toronto in Parliament. This is a misrepresentation unworthy of a minister of the Gospel, and an Editor of a religious journal.

I trust, Mr. Editor, you will see that the subject is one of general concern, and that your journal advocates its own principles of civil and religious liberty, in undertaking to disabuse the public mind in relation to it, and by proving to the whole Province that the members of the Wesleyan Methodist Church, at least in the City of Toronto, do not sanction the public conduct of Dr. Ryerson, nor confirm the statement of the Editor of the *Guardian* in relation to the *Toronto Periodical Journal*. I will not take up any portion of your columns in defending the *Toronto Periodical Journal*, as it is not my business; nor the private character of its Editor, though I hesitate not to say, that very many will join me in concluding that the *Guardian* has a bad cause to defend, in resorting to so mean and low a course, as to attempt to degrade an individual, instead of confuting his arguments. I pity the paltry childishness displayed in calling him the hired scribe, &c. Is not the Editor of the *Guardian* hired? and, if he does not make a better defence, hired to do what he may well blush for. Hired! forsooth! He is so disinterested and independent as to be willing to perform the duties of his office gratuitously! For the worth of the performance to the cause of religion, he might be justified in doing so, but we do not suppose that such is his opinion. Are not the Preachers and the Superintendent of the Book Store hired also? Is not their master, Dr. Ryerson, hired with a vengeance? The Editor of the *Guardian* ought to be just as full about hiring scribes.