

Guardian in the affair, though it is now quite evident they are parties or rather the chief actors in it, a few days ago the columns of the *Colonist* were placed at the disposal of an anonymous writer, and an article was inserted, with the intention of degrading the private character of the writer of this journal. That person wrote a reply, in which he declined to defend himself from anonymous attacks, but only stated one or two points of importance affecting the Methodist body, accompanied with a simple denial of the slander, and requested the usual honorable dealing on the part of the Editor of the *Colonist*, on the occasion, — that having admitted the offensive article, he would publish a denial of it. The Editor of that paper returned the Manuscript, declining to insert it in his paper. The managers of the *Christian Guardian* (we do not refer personally to the Editor) longed to denounce our journal as soon as it was born, would have gladly given the slanderous article a place in their columns; but that course, it was doubtless perceived, would be a direct attack on the *Toronto Periodical Journal*, which it was not their policy to let the Methodist body know was in existence, though they must know it circulates extensively throughout the Province. They therefore resolve on getting an extra of the *Colonist* printed, and inserted in the folds of the *Guardian*, and sent to its country subscribers. It will be remembered that a similar proceeding was resorted to when first Mr. Ryerson's political writings appeared in the *Colonist*, in consequence of their being inadmissible in the *Christian Guardian*. The present occurrence is a repetition of that low trick, and now confirms the impression that the managers of the *Christian Guardian* were then the real actors in the affair, though they denied it, and made an explicable explanation. There can be no doubt now, that the insertion of this slip constitutes an adoption of authorship on the part of the *Christian Guardian*, — that journal is liable to the same responsibility as if its own columns contained the slander, and we shall treat it accordingly. Respecting the attack made on private character, it will not be defended in this or any other paper, with the exception of simply declaring the falsehood of it which will be proved in proper time and place. The authors will have the satisfaction to know that they may carry on their system of assassination of private character without imitation. They will have the unenviable merit of not being able otherwise to resist the facts brought against their public conduct. There will be no retaliation of that description, they may depend upon it, though they are, apparently, quite unaware of their own vulnerable position. We have ample materials for this, if we were inclined to descend to the level of the *Christian Guardian*. The Editor of this journal was addressed by one of the Ministry, in the very elegant words, "go ahead—do your worst." "we are prepared." We hope we are also prepared; and now, we will only ask the person who challenged us to go ahead, what induced one of our most esteemed ministers to stand up in his place in the Conference, beseeching that body with tears, not to send forth a person as a preacher of the Gospel? Will the public believe that the same person was sent, notwithstanding?—Yes! sent to lower the standard of practical religion among the members of the Church. Before the managers of the *Christian Guardian* had degraded themselves by traducing private character, it would be thought that they would have protected themselves a little better than they have done. On the subject of defamation of private character, we have little fear that the Methodist body will approve of the conduct of the *Christian Guardian*; we rather think that most of those who have received that paper, with the slanderous enclosure, will return the *Guardian* with indignation. We have been informed that a Principal in the business has admitted the issue of this slip from the office of the *Christian Guardian*. It is therefore fully established that the managers of the *Christian Guardian* can resort to clandestine means of opposing a journal, which they dare not permit to be noticed in their columns, not being able to refute the facts brought against the editors of the Conference, by the *Toronto Periodical Journal* or *Wesleyan Methodist*.

Another reason for the non-insertion of the defamatory article in question, in the columns of the *Guardian* is, that its managers could not do so without violating two imperative obligations, first, that of the Word of God, "Speak evil of no man;" secondly, that of the church, which exposes them to expulsion on being convicted of slandering a member of their own church."

THE UNIVERSITY BILL.

Before our present number is in circulation, the University Bill, will, in all probability, be disposed of for the present Session of Parliament. We should have considered it a subject foreign to the object of our journal, did not the *Christian Guardian* represent its views on the question, to be those of the members of the Wesleyan Methodist Church. We are far from being able to assent to this assertion, though in consequence of the non-existence of a journal hitherto expressing the opinions of the members of the Church; it is impossible to prevent an impression, to some extent, that the *Christian Guardian* expresses the opinions of the whole body. We have not had sufficient time nor opportunity to canvass the subject, but we believe

we do not say too much, when we say that there prevails extensively sentiments of a very opposite character to those expressed in the *Christian Guardian*.

The views of a large portion of the body are, that each religious denomination ought to support its own institutions, with regard to the religious instruction of its younger, as well as its older members. They see no reason why the Provincial funds should be expended for the instruction of the one, more than for the edification of the other. This separates the religious from the secular part of the question. If the people are willing to bear all the expenses of the former, why should they either be deprived of the benefits of education in secular matters, or be compelled to receive religious instruction from a source to them objectionable, and to contribute to the expense of it also. With regard to the real benefit to this body, and the Colleges in particular, resulting from government aid, we ask what good has it done to Victoria College. There was a time when that College required the aid of the denomination to which it belongs; an appeal was made to the people in consequence of delay in payment of a promised Government grant for £4000. That appeal was responded to by the people giving half a dollar each, and the £4000 was raised or nearly so; they however afterwards, received the government allowance of £4000. At that time, the College was filled with pupils, and was very popular. Since then, it has received £500 per annum from government, and has relied on the people less, and looks to the government for more. While notwithstanding the members of the families of the ruling parties, are fast settling together in Cobourg, to complete a kind of family compact system, showing most evidently their diminished reliance on their people, and their increased dependence on the Government. The views of the people may be briefly expressed thus, "give us our rights with regard to the provision made for education generally, and leave us to ourselves in religious matters." We believe a great portion of the members of the Wesleyan Methodist Church will maintain these views in opposition to those advocated as being those of the whole body in the *Christian Guardian*.

THE UNIVERSITY BILL AND THE CHRISTIAN GUARDIAN.

"And seeketh thou great things for thyself? Seek them not."

The University Bill appears to be the all absorbing topic of the week. It has come before the public on the proposed principle of doing "equal justice" to the youth of "all Christian denominations." Bishop Strachan, the author of the first Charter, designed also, we have no doubt, to do equal justice to the youth of Upper Canada, by making them equal partakers of the blessings of "The Church as by law established." He, therefore, wisely provided in that Charter against all non-conformist interference in its management, by the annexation of the clause making it imperative upon its officers and its professors, to subscribe to the thirty-nine articles. Having himself emerged from the thick darkness of Presbyterianism into the glorious light of Episcopacy, it was perfectly natural that he should desire to make others partakers in its inestimable benefits. The wicked spirits, on the side of non-conformity, however, have impeded the progress of his Apostolic plan, and he has occasionally been under the necessity of rebuking them with much severity, especially when any scrutiny was being made as to financial matters. The following letter is one among the many of this kind. It was written in reply to a letter of the Civil-secretary, for certain information to be furnished to a Select-committee of the Assembly, as to the £1300 costs of the Bishop's pilgrimage to Oxford and London, in 1826, to get the Charter—

"The services I was enabled to perform were duly appreciated in England; and I feel justified in declaring, for it is now matter of fact, that they have been and ever will be beneficial to the Province: nor is this the first time when the University of King's College, the establishment of which, on a more liberal footing than any similar institution in Great Britain and America, I was the humble instrument in effecting, will shed light and glory over the Colony, and embalm the name of its promoters in the grateful affections of posterity, when its ignorant and rancorous revilers are forgotten or deservedly consigned to contempt and execration, as having been ready to sacrifice the most important interests of the present and future generations in deference to a popular clamour, which they, themselves, had for the purpose created.

(Signed) JOHN STRACHAN

LIEUTENANT-COLONEL ROWAN, Civil Secretary, &c.

Toronto, 17th March, 1835."

It will be observed that the Bishop considered the old Charter as placing the University "on a more liberal footing than any similar institution in Great Britain or America," and he now desires, as an act of "bare justice" to the people of the Colony, that the 7th, William IV., cap. 10, amending that Charter, should be repealed; and, "as a fair and honest way" of settling all difficulties, that the endowment of King's College should remain untouched in his hands, and that no denomination should be allowed to interfere at all in its management. This is maintaining the original status: this is doing "equal justice" to all.

We make these remarks illustrative of the meaning of many of the terms employed in the Clerical vocabulary of our day: "equal rights," "equal justice," "equal privileges," "enlightened liberality," &c. &c.

always have referred to the interests of the party using them.

A cotemporary refers to the two schemes of Bishop Strachan, and to the hearty concurrence of the *Christian Guardian* with one of them, namely, as to the division of the endowments, provided that the share should prove adequate to its expectations. The editor of the *Guardian*, in his number of the 12th instant, denounces the amalgamation scheme of the bill now before Parliament, in the following language:—"He believed that 'no denomination was in love with it.' We, as Methodists, have no desire to mix with other bodies in the education of our youth; Methodists alone know how to promote the welfare of Methodism: 'the plan was a mere theory—a theory likely to fail in practice.'" "The peace of the Christian Church is not promoted by separation;" in such a case, by constant association, the parties will appear as hallicent armies rather than disciples of Christ: "the presence of the polemics of the Colleges would soon open the way for dissension in the University, and divisions and weakness in the Caput." "We know not what extravagant bodies may yet arise, and grow so strong as to take advantage of this bill, and plant their Colleges abreast of ours of the most opposite tenets and practices. America is a hot-bed for the breeding of sects—let us not make it still more genial." "An open University, allowing chaplains of the principal denominations, would be better than the projected plan of a Loxdston University, attracting and holding fast a number of surrounding Colleges." "The plan is novel—a henc-e built on scaffolding, is in danger every hour of falling to the ground." Considering what man is, and what Christian sects have been to each other, we shrink from the responsibility of advocating a measure which we are strongly apprehensive of failing." There is nothing equivocal in all this, it is plain, downright unqualified opposition to the Ministerial measure, not because the great body of the non-Episcopalian will, in reality, be excluded from the enjoyment of the privileges of the University, but because it was anticipated that the endowments might be divided, and that the Methodist Preachers or rulers of the Conference might obtain out of it the management of from \$6,000 to \$10,000 a year. Bishop Strachan, we may remark, had then given his consent publicly to divide the spoil. The *Christian Guardian* believed him to be sincere. "The high station of the writer (says the editor) forbids our entertaining doubts of his sincerity, and requires us to believe that he really desires, at least, a just and equitable settlement of the question." "One equally as wise as our cotemporary tells us, 'I have seen the wrecked in great power.' High station or great power is not, then, a guarantee for integrity, justice, or benevolence. Our readers will be rather surprised to find Methodist Preachers placing men in the position of committing crimes with impunity. This is the plain meaning of their language. Dr. Strachan's 'high station' is quite a guarantee for sincerity. We have remarked, that the foregoing denunciations of Mr. Draper's bill, and the strong expressions of confidence in Bishop Strachan's "equal justice," appeared in the *Guardian* of the 12th instant; but in the very next number of that journal, issued on the 19th, the tables are completely turned—in the short space of one week the mind of the editor has undergone a complete revolution: he now is induced to support the bill, and he condemns the insincerity of the Bishop! Lake Egerton Ryerson, the x-editor of that journal, our cotemporary wisely made provision for beating a retreat if necessary. Well he manifestly opposed the Government measure he studiously aimed at non-commitment—while fairly over it he would still keep one leg upon the fence—

"Whether we shall side with the amalgamation principle of the bill, or the dividing principles of the Bill is still at our option, and depends on what we shall hereafter see," is the language which formed the hinge of vacillation, and the alleged cause of the change is contained in the following oracular saying: "We looked for what we have not seen, and we have seen what we have not looked for!" What our cotemporary looked for, and did not see, we are not told. We may fairly conjecture, however, that it was an expression of the Bishop's approbation of the editor's scheme of dividing the University endowment equally between Methodism, Residual Presbyterianism, and Episcopalianism, leaving others to make the best of the remainder. This he has not seen. He has seen, however, the present College Council making application to Parliament against either amalgamation or partition of the endowment; therefore, he has changed. We may remark, that it was upon the principle of amalgamating various denominational Colleges in the University that he opposed the bill; and yet, although that principle remained unchanged, he now approves of it. We do not, in fact, discover one altered feature in the bill, to which he could refer as a reason for his now supporting it. It is true, that Mr. John Ryerson, in the meantime, had returned from his mission to Montreal, upon the University question and the grant to Victoria College, and had written to the editor from Cobourg, under date of the 11th instant, approving of the equal justice and the enlightened liberality of the Government." Mr. Green had also written a letter to the editor, in which he expressed his wish, that as "the bill is placed on such principles of equal justice and equal privileges (i. o. trusts) that it will receive hearty support and co-operation of all who wish peace and contentment." It is remarkable that in both these letters are similar