

Technical and Bibliographic Notes / Notes techniques et bibliographiques

The Institute has attempted to obtain the best original copy available for filming. Features of this copy which may be bibliographically unique, which may alter any of the images in the reproduction, or which may significantly change the usual method of filming, are checked below.

L'Institut a microfilmé le meilleur exemplaire qu'il lui a été possible de se procurer. Les détails de cet exemplaire qui sont peut-être uniques du point de vue bibliographique, qui peuvent modifier une image reproduite, ou qui peuvent exiger une modification dans la méthode normale de filmage sont indiqués ci-dessous.

- Coloured covers/
Couverture de couleur
- Covers damaged/
Couverture endommagée
- Covers restored and/or laminated/
Couverture restaurée et/ou pelliculée
- Cover title missing/
Le titre de couverture manque
- Coloured maps/
Cartes géographiques en couleur
- Coloured ink (i.e. other than blue or black)/
Encre de couleur (i.e. autre que bleue ou noire)
- Coloured plates and/or illustrations/
Planches et/ou illustrations en couleur
- Bound with other material/
Relié avec d'autres documents
- Tight binding may cause shadows or distortion along interior margin/
La reliure serrée peut causer de l'ombre ou de la distorsion le long de la marge intérieure
- Blank leaves added during restoration may appear within the text. Whenever possible, these have been omitted from filming/
Il se peut que certaines pages blanches ajoutées lors d'une restauration apparaissent dans le texte, mais, lorsque cela était possible, ces pages n'ont pas été filmées.

- Coloured pages/
Pages de couleur
- Pages damaged/
Pages endommagées
- Pages restored and/or laminated/
Pages restaurées et/ou pelliculées
- Pages discoloured, stained or foxed/
Pages décolorées, tachetées ou piquées
- Pages detached/
Pages détachées
- Showthrough/
Transparence
- Quality of print varies/
Qualité inégale de l'impression
- Continuous pagination/
Pagination continue
- Includes index(es)/
Comprend un (des) index

Title on header taken from:/
Le titre de l'en-tête provient:

- Title page of issue/
Page de titre de la livraison
- Caption of issue/
Titre de départ de la livraison
- Masthead/
Générique (périodiques) de la livraison

Additional comments:/
Commentaires supplémentaires: Some pages are cut off.

This item is filmed at the reduction ratio checked below/
Ce document est filmé au taux de réduction indiqué ci-dessous.

10X	12X	14X	16X	18X	20X	22X	24X	26X	28X	30X	32X
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

TORONTO PERIODICAL JOURNAL.

OR, WESLEYAN METHODIST.

"THE TRUTH SHALL MAKE YOU FREE."—JOHN viii. 32.

VOL. I.

TORONTO, FEBRUARY, 1845.

No. 2.

THE TORONTO PERIODICAL JOURNAL; or, **WESLEYAN METHODIST**, published under the Superintendence of a Committee—Members of the Wesleyan Methodist Church.

Price Two Shillings and Sixpence for Six Months, from January 1st, 1845; payable in advance.

Persons remitting Ten Shillings will be entitled to Five Copies, or Friends who will kindly procure Two or more Subscribers, and by remitting the Amount to the Address of the Publisher, will receive a Copy gratis.

NOTICE TO SUBSCRIBERS.

All Communications are requested to be addressed to the Editor, No. 57 Box, Post-Office, and to Messrs. Lesslie Brothers, King Street, Toronto, where the Paper is for Sale.

Toronto, 1st February, 1845.

THE WESLEYAN METHODIST.

"When preachers of the Gospel become parties in party politics, religion mourns, the Church is unedified, and political disputes agitate even the faithful of the land. Such preachers, no matter which side they take, are no longer the messengers of glad tidings, but the seedsmen of confusion, and wasters of the heritage of Christ."—*Life of Dr. Adam Clarke.*

TORONTO, FEBRUARY, 1845.

Junius' Letter—Continued from last Number.

Governor General not be realized, the disgrace must fall on him who excited them; and hence all the policy of a political sophist will be used to pervert the judgment of the community. But it is a fortunate circumstance that that community is too well informed concerning great occurrences to submit their judgment to the ever varying schemes of violent partizanship. The many failures attending this individual's public career, are too fresh in the minds of the members of his own communion, to allow them to place any confidence in his opinions. Never, perhaps, have as many miscarriages fallen to the lot of any one man during the course of a short life. A restless, meddling spirit has meddled with and marred everything upon which it has touched. Those peaceful societies were torn asunder and shaken to their very centre by the same agency, in the union with the English Conference. Had we listened to the wise counsels of the Fathers of the Church, this disgrace had not befallen us. I speak not against either body. I honour them both. But the Toryism of the English Wesleyans could not harmonise with the political views of Egerton Ryerson, however Conservative he might have become while breathing the atmosphere of England. That same childlike agitation which was instrumental in uniting, forced upon the two great bodies the necessity of a separation. They were subsequently driven to do what they would never have done, but for the circumstances which, created for personal purposes, compelled them to the performance of acts, which inflicted deep wounds upon the hearts of those venerable and prudent servants of the Church. Who, after considering that last, violent, schoolboy act of the reverend gentleman, on his departure

from London, can suppose that a grave body will allow themselves to be influenced by the author of such actions?

Other considerations will show this to be an unfortunate appointment for the Government. Those who have supported his Excellency during the present crisis, will not look upon this act as a reward for their services. Tories and Churchmen have been the most prominent supporters of his Excellency since the resignation of the Ministry. This appointment is conferred upon an enemy of "the Church" and a former Whig. Whether this transformation into a Tory will also metamorphose his enmity to the Church of England into friendship time will prove. Nor is it flattering to the many learned men of the country, that one represented to be of slender attainments in a few common branches of English education, and totally ignorant of mathematics and classics, should be entrusted with the education of the country, many of whose youthful scholars have attained higher knowledge than their Superintendent. The County, Township, and City Superintendents frequently require assistance and advice in the selection and examination of teachers. But to whom are they to go?

There is yet another objection to this appointment, I contend that no violent political partisan ought to be entrusted with the office of Superintendent of Education. The country will not be satisfied and will justly doubt the wisdom and sound policy of the Government in such an act. Education ought to be kept as free as possible from all political influence. It will not be satisfactory to state that the office is not a political one. It is enough to know that the incumbent is the most violent political partisan in the country. That this will have its influence facts might be adduced from colleges in operation even in this Province,—but I forbear for the present.

JUNIUS.

We are under the necessity of withholding a number of articles referred to in our last number, though we promised them in this. Having received other important communications, which more than supply the place of those omitted, and which answer the same purposes as facts in support of various assertions made by us, we hope the omissions will be excused. The following letter, however, being one of them, we cannot omit, as it proves that the Rev. Egerton Ryerson did attempt to use the columns of the *Guardian* in defence of Sir Charles Metcalfe, notwithstanding his denial to the contrary:—

COPY OF A LETTER WRITTEN TO DR. RYERSON, BY MR. SCOTT, IN REPLY TO A LETTER RECEIVED FROM MR. R., ON THE SUBJECT OF A CERTAIN POLITICAL ARTICLE, SENT FOR INSERTION IN THE *Christian Guardian*,—[Not sent but another instead.]

MY DEAR BROTHER,

On * * * * *
 reply to my Letter of the * * * * *
Guardian of your article * * * * *
 the Governor-General," &c. * * * * *

I regret that in the commencement of your letter, you, among other things equally severe, say, "I will

columns of the *Guardian*, I will go to another journal first." Let me observe, I never wished you to "beg" for any thing of the kind. You sent me an article for that paper, and I conscientiously stated to you my fears that its publication would infringe Conference rule, and asked you permission for me to consult the Book Committee for advice—a duty imposed upon, and a privilege allowed me, when as the Editor, I am in a difficulty respecting an article sent me for insertion.

You say, "I think that the notice of the Reform Dinner, the insertion of Mr. Hinck's speech, (or few of our people can tolerate him, though they respect Mr. Baldwin,) and several other things have given a party bias to the *Guardian*." I reply, that the "notice of the Reform Dinner," is a mere common news item, like other notices of the election of members of Parliament, &c.—without any expression by me of political or party views. Mr. Hinck's speech is an avowal of sentiment, on the University Bill, and not of political views, or views of his party. His sentiments accord with those of our College Board, your articles, as well as my own published in the *Guardian*.

If, as you intimate, I have published articles having a party bias, I know it not, and am ready to receive the just condemnation of the Conference. I thank you for your suggestion relative to the guarding of our people, against undue excitement at the present critical time, and, should I find them in spirit, going too far in public matters, I will avail myself of the suggestion and tender them a little religious advice.

* * * * *
 * * * * *
 * * * * *
 * * * * *
 * * * * *
 * * * * *
 * * * * *
 * * * * *

that portion of your article, I am now speaking of, to be, in general, a sentiment of your mind on certain political subjects, and especially a favourable expression of your views of the position of one of the political parties in a contest. I mean that of the Governor-General, and, therefore, consider, that my publication of such an expression from the powerful pen of one of the most influential ministers of our Church, would be deemed by the Conference a violation of its laws.

If it can be shown that my apprehensions on the subject are groundless, most gladly will I change my present disagreeable position towards you; for I do not as you well know, like to differ with you on any subject. Such being the state of the case, I am compelled to repeat what I said in my last, that I feel utterly unable to send you a final decision respecting the insertion of as much of the article as you specify, and cannot do it without the direction of the Book Committee. I wrote again, therefore, to ask your permission for me to consult them.

I remain, yours affectionately,

JONATHAN SCOTT.

From the Christian Guardian.

We announced, in our paper of Dec. 18th, that some anonymous persons had shown a forwardness to seek and expose some trifling flaws relative to some Ministers of the Gospel. We said that a friend had volunteered to hear what proofs are possessed for what has been said. The proofs have been called for "Have they been afforded?" No. Then the character of the writer is in no degree advanced by his writings, which manifest a flaw in his disposition, greater perhaps than that of which he complains. We should not notice the subject but for the *Examiner* shutting up his columns against further communications. We are not sorry for this. Yet it is necessary for our respected friend to say through us, as he cannot through our contemporary, that he regards the late reply to his call for proof of past charges as no answer at all. Not only is there no proof, but

With such a writer it is useless to correspond. His charges have been denied. Mischarges are unproved. Thus the matter stands.

TRIFLING FLAWS.

The above extract refers to a letter published in the *Examiner* of Nov. 13, signed "A Wesleyan Methodist," and to the reply thereto by the Rev. H. Wilkinson, Secretary of the Conference, in a subsequent number of the same journal. Since the charges contained in the former are designated *trifling flaws*, it is but fair that those who are in the position corresponding to that of purchasers of such wares, should examine them to see if they do not deserve another appellation. The nature and extent of these trifling flaws will be seen in the following letters:—

MR WILKINSON'S LETTER

To the Editor of the *Examiner*,

DEAR SIR,—In your paper of the 4th instant, is a lengthy editorial headed "The Christian Guardian and our Correspondents," in which you offer many remarks upon the importance of a "free press," to which remarks I shall take no manner of exception, save the single one that it strikes me, that the connection is not very apparent between that freedom of the press, which renders the press one of the greatest blessings to the human family, and the allowing it to be the ready vehicle of anonymous attacks upon gentlemen holding various respectable positions in the Church and in the community, whose claim to sincerity and veracity, (a claim I will surrender to no man,) is perhaps not a whit behind that of the man, who, for reasons best known to himself, refuses to look in the face, the persons he most wantonly endeavours to injure.

Into the controversy (if it be one) between yourself and the Editor of the *Christian Guardian*, I have not the slightest intention to enter, though I do beg leave to object to your (unnecessarily as I conceive) censuring the few general remarks of the *Guardian* Editor, as a reply to the article of Nov. 13th, either official or otherwise; as it seems to me it must be quite plain to every reader, that neither in point of fact, nor by profession, do his remarks in any wise interfere by way of replication with a single statement made, or one position taken therein. The unpleasant use you strongly incline to make of that construction is necessarily infinitely improper; and it is because of the peculiar service into which you endeavour to press it that I feel myself obliged, from a regard to truth, to abide objectively to the injustice of your construction.

Allow me also to observe that I consider you are a little astray, when you, by implication, I think certainly, impute the right of anonymous writers, attacking known individuals in Society, uniformly to claim a reply—a wrong position this assuredly. Unless you intended to teach this doctrine, I am utterly at a loss how to account for your hasty, and I will say, *crude* assumptions in the premises. The absence of a reply in the present case, you at once decide to be a guilty thing, behind the bulwarks of legal forms and technicalities, and even affirmatively inquire, whether the "silence adopted is not an *admission* of the facts," when a "Wesleyan Methodist" has arrayed in his communication. It would seem that the idea never entered into your mind, that the persons attacked might have some very good reasons of a wise and pure character, for declining a newspaper controversy on the topics adverted to, and especially so with a masked or anonymous writer. What a pity that we are so prone to incline to one side in such matters.

But, Sir, I do now most solemnly assure you and all concerned, that the silence observed in the case ought to be attributed to other reasons than conscious guilt, or an admission of the truth of numerous incorrect statements of the writer—to reasons however, which the lovers of strife and of schism, and a few restless croakers in Methodism, are ill-prepared to appreciate. And I would add, that so far as I am concerned, that silence would have been perpetual, and a "Wesleyan Methodist" and all who patronize with him, should have been perfectly welcome to all the spoil that they could possibly realize therefrom had you not mined some portion of your editorial of the 4th instant.

The unbecomable use made by yourself of a course adopted (I speak so far as I am concerned) in the fear of God, as the best on the whole, and involving no little self-denial and fortitude, on my part, materially changes my views of duty, and, as I prayerfully conceive, relieves me of all responsibility as to the results of a plain statement or two upon the subject. Besides, in addition to the evil construction put upon such forbearance by yourself, (and I learn from others also) the marked accuser of the brethren, is presumptuous enough to say, "I dare the parties implicated rightfully to set aside any of the facts

which I have referred to in this letter." Such being the state to which the author of the article and the "free press" have brought matters. I feel myself positively required to touch the foul thing of Nov. 13th, just so far as may tend to give both yourself and the public to understand, whether your correspondent and his anonymous publications, really are deserving of more than common courtesy, or indeed of any "courtesy" at all, at the hands of the parties he has attacked and belied. Of the article of Nov. 13th, as a whole, I heartily pronounce it to be a tissue of shameful misstatement, misrepresentation, and untruth. Of the particular so-called "facts," "any" of which we are "dared" to "set aside," I shall select at present but two, (though others are generally at fault,) and shall honour them with rather more than a "savage's arrow," now my hand is in. First, then, the writer states that at a certain Book Committee, an individual present, (it is with the facts, and not the person, we have to do) unblushingly held out the "threat" to the Committee, "that unless fully supported (POLITICALLY) by the Conference, he would not advocate the claims of the Church in England." And, secondly, that on the same occasion, it was affirmed by the same individual, "were the preachers to do their part, his writings would have their desired effect upon the people." Now here are two of the writer's so-called facts, they are statements said to have been made before the Book Committee. And for the sake of effect, I suppose, the writer has chosen to present them as quotations of what actually dropped from the lips of the Speaker, not only thereby securing the precise sense conveyed, but the very words by which that sense was communicated. Here then is something definite. Now is it *truth*, or is it *untruth*, which the writer conveys by these professed quotations? This is the important point; and especially so as from the statements as given by him various criminal inferences are gladly deduced by the writer, in order to prejudice the community against certain "leading ministers" in the Conference. As I read your Editorial of the 4th instant, you substantially endorse the whole, and as we have already seen, the writer boldly dares the parties implicated, to set aside "any" of his facts.

What then must be the judgment of the candid public, when they are informed that the pretended quotations, given above, are not true. As a member of the Book Committee, and of course, as a competent witness in the case, and as an individual "dared" to state the truth, I do solemnly and solemnly aver that they are not true. The writer has boldly enough asserted these and other *untruths* to be facts, but he has not proved them. The burden of proof, of course, lies with him. That proof was not to be expected, and, surely, it must be *proof*, and not evasion or quibble. Should he fail to adduce his proof, I demand a public retraction of his assertions and inferences. And if it should happen that he cannot do the latter, and still not do the former, he will then be left to enjoy the only remaining and unclaimed alternative, and stand before the community as the originator and propagator of calumny and falsehood. In whatever the mask he has assumed may be found of essential service.

With these few observations, written in one sense much against my will, I shall close for the present, and remain, dear Sir,

Yours very respectfully,

H WILKINSON.

Toronto City, December 6th, 1841

REJOINDER OF "A WESLEYAN."

To the Editor of the *Examiner*.

Cobourg Dec 21st, 1841

DEAR SIR,—Allow me to return you my grateful acknowledgments for the courteous manner in which you were pleased to notice my last communication of the 13th ultimo, in your independent and influential journal. I do so the more cheerfully because it has been the cause of bringing before the public, through your paper of the 18th instant, the Official reply of Mr Wilkinson, Secretary of the Conference; and because you have thus done justice to both parties, by giving me an opportunity of judging righteously of the great and important matters it raised between us. I only regret that that reply should have been confined to the *Examiner*, and clarity towards the Secretary would lead me to hope that he was not afraid of the light, although he did not give it publicity in the *Guardian*, as I think he should have done. Since he has deemed it necessary to appear as the expounder of the truth, in relation to the subjects to which my letters have referred, and as the points in dispute are now between Mr. Wilkinson and the readers of your journal merely, but between the great body of the Methodist people and the leading Preachers in the connection, I beg to express my sincere opinion, that in justice to all, it would be better in future not to publish in your paper any reply to my letters from official sources, unless the parties come out first with their communication through the official organ of the Conference. If the parties implicated by my statements be innocent of the charges I have alleged against them (as they declare they are) the publication of my productions with their own official defence, would only tend to establish them in the esteem and confidence of the community. Or otherwise, if my

communications are deemed to be too long, or couched in language which they may consider unbecoming or disagreeable, let the charges only, with the whole of their defence, be fairly exhibited through the *Guardian*. To this arrangement, the innocent, certainly, can have no objections; and I may add, that it would give me and many of my Christian brethren the highest satisfaction, if the whole of the charges, which I and they believe to be founded in truth, were found in reality to have no foundation whatever. I pity the individual who can wantonly accuse his fellow Christian, and I despise the character of him, who, seeing error or iniquity, under whatever guise it may appear, does not endeavour, to the best of his ability, to have it removed, even at the hazard of being considered a disturber of the peace.

Such being my convictions of duty, I design, on the present occasion, not only to refer to the very unsatisfactory replies which have been given to my last communication, but to add other reasons based upon facts, showing the imperative necessity of adopting some wise and vigorous remedial scheme to arrest our eyes with which our church has been periodically visited, through the uncommittable political meddling of weak, selfish, or corrupt men, to whose hands our government has been committed. In doing so I shall endeavour not to resort to the use of object language, similar to that which has been employed by the Editor of the *Guardian* and the Secretary of the Conference, in their references to that large and influential class whose sentiments I have uttered through the Press. Our notices may indeed be cast out as *evils*—we may be denominated, as we have been by those of whom better things might have been expected, as "*Croakers in Methodism*," our honest statements may be denounced as a "*fool thing*," the origin of our humble efforts to purify the Wesleyan Church in this Province from all the elements "which have generated strife and division amongst us in past times, may be traced to "*bad ferment coming from sour stomachs*;" but language such as this, while it can have no tendency to sustain a good cause, does on the contrary tend materially to lower, in the estimation of intelligent and good men, the character of those who may in their defence, employ it instead of facts and arguments. Such language is not at all calculated, in my opinion, to advance in public estimation, the literary standing of the leading ministers in our connection or the Conference Journal,—quite the reverse, and I deeply regret that it has been so often resorted to in this discussion.

I trust, therefore, that while reviewing Mr. Wilkinson's, or any other communication, I shall not fall into the same errors, but shall be guided by a spirit of Christian moderation toward those with whom I differ, and whose conduct I may be required justly to condemn. The official Secretary, in his letter published in your journal, has declared my communication of the 13th November, to be a tissue of *shameful misstatements, misrepresentations, and untruths*. Now for one member of a Christian Church to be charged by his brother with a *whit* misstatement of facts, cannot but be regarded by community as a very grave offence, and although his name may be sheltered behind an anonymous signature, yet it is no less incumbent on him to rescue himself from such a charge by such evidence as the nature of the case will allow. Here I may again remark, that the peculiar relationship which exists between the Methodist body generally and the Preachers in connection, renders it absolutely necessary for Lay Members when warring against the errors or delinquencies of their official brethren to do it from behind a masked battery. I deplore this necessity, and sincerely wish that all such matters could be equitably arranged by the brethren in open assembly, without resorting to the anonymous discussion of our differences before the world in the columns of a newspaper. Under existing circumstances, however, we have no other alternative, but the great end at which we aim by this discussion, is to render, in future time, such an alternative altogether unnecessary.

Before entering particularly into the merits of Mr. Wilkinson's letter, I may first briefly recapitulate some of the causes which led me into controversy with the Secretary of the Conference, with a view of giving the community the means of judging fairly as to my well grounded complaints against Dr. Ryerson, and the leaders of our Conference. In the early part of the present year, having from unquestionable sources been made acquainted with various matters of political intrigue, concocted between the principal of Victoria College, and the leading preachers of the connection regarding a desired scheme of a permanent government grant to that institution, I deemed it my duty publicly to direct the attention of the President of the Conference, to the humiliating circumstance in which the members of our body have frequently been placed by the political manoeuvres and stratagems of our preachers, and called upon him as the official head of the Conference if possible to avert the evils with which the Church was again threatened. In that communication, I casually mentioned the name of the Secretary of the Conference in connection with a strange dereliction of duty concerning the non-presentation of an important memorial transmitted by him from the City of Toronto, to be laid before Conference. In that transaction, it would seem, that there was either a most lamentable absence of common sincerity on the part of the Secretary, or the temptation which surround-

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 *iss 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 impudence 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 submit these statements 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 not, 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 ought, 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 books well bound 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

favour, no one at all conversant with our history can doubt. But if any one should be inclined to call this in question, the language of the *Christian Guardian*, of the 11th instant, will, I am sure, fully convince them. The Editor there remarks, "THE PRINCIPLE OF THE STATE FURTHERING THE GOSPEL IS NEVER COMPLAINED OF IN OUR COLUMNS." And it may not, perhaps, be generally known, that John Ryerson has of late, been specially commissioned to proceed to Montreal, thus to "further the Gospel," or rather, to look after what is more properly termed the secular interests of the Conference,—meaning, of course, the unsected grant of some £1,000 or £5,000,—an endowment to Victoria College;—and particularly a share of the Clergy Reserves! Here, Mr. Editor, is one of the main branches of the root of all our difficulties. Our preachers are already, under the present Constitution of the Church, quite independent of the membership except as to finances; but when the Government support is obtained, they will, in a great measure, be independent of them as to this particular also.

Need we, under such circumstances, be astonished, Sir, at the political corruption,—the hypocritical knesee,—the moral turpitude, which have sprung up from such a root; or at the disastrous results which may yet proceed to the Church, from a calm submission to the operation of principles so much opposed to the self-denying principles of the Gospel? It has been with us in reality, "a root bearing gall and wormwood."—we have realized the truth of the prophetic announcement, "because iniquity shall abound, the love of many shall wax cold." How truly, how extensively has this been experienced by the Methodist people in Canada! But I must bring my letter to a close, and, in doing so, I would remark, that my sole aim, in all my communications, has been to lend my humble influence to put down evils which have grown to an appalling magnitude in the Church. I am not sensible of having, in any instance, stated that which is contrary to truth, but have rigidly confined myself to matters which from time to time have come under my own observation, or which have come to my knowledge from respectable and authentic sources. I desire the most searching scrutiny into all that I have written, and I assure the parties implicated, that I will as openly and freely acknowledge any error which may be fairly proved against me, either as to facts or deductions, as I have been fearless to express or expose them.

I remain, very respectfully,

A WESLEYAN METHODIST.

POLITICS AND PARTIES.

The above is the title prefixed to the resolutions of the last Conference, in relation to the public interference of the Ministers of Religion in the Politics of the day. These very resolutions, in our judgment, instead of settling an important question, raise the same question in such a manner as to excite an interest therein, never felt before in the Methodist Church. The following are the resolutions referred to:—

"POLITICS AND PARTIES."

"What is the judgment of this Conference in regard to our relation to the secular politics of the day?"

Resolved.—That while we disclaim all intention of controlling the political sentiments of any of our Ministers, or Members, so long as those sentiments do not contravene the Discipline of our Church, nor contradict the Word of God, we will not, as a body, be responsible for the political doctrines of any member or members of our Conference, or Church, or party in our country, but leave our people perfectly free to exercise their own judgment in Political and civil affairs.

Resolved.—That in view of the recent Act of the Legislature, prohibiting Clergymen and Ministers from voting at elections, no person in our church is recognised by this Conference as a Minister who has not been ordained by the imposition of hands according to our Doctrines, and Discipline."

We are constrained to make some remarks on these resolutions, in support of our opinion—that they do not meet the question, and that they give evidence of the political tendency of the mind of the Conference of an opposite character.

We first observe, that the above resolutions

are not merely the opinions of the Conference, but their decision on the question, and given in the solemn and official manner in which all their decisions are given.

Let us then look at what has been decided. We take up two passages which speak the same thing: "We disclaim all intention of controlling the political sentiments of any of our Ministers or Members, so long as these sentiments do not contravene the discipline of our church, nor contradict the Word of God." Allowing these two exceptions, what is the declaration? Simply this: We disclaim all intention of controlling the political sentiments of any of our Ministers or members. We ask, was this necessary to be decided by the Conference? Ought a question of the kind ever to arise? And, it having arisen, as we say, without necessity, it amounts to no more than a declaration that the Conference will not do what they have no right to do.

The other passage is merely a repetition of the former—we will "leave our people perfectly free to exercise their own judgment in political and civil affairs." Nothing, in our opinion, can justify the appearance of such disclaimers, but the well known existence of just grounds to conclude that the very opposite course has been attempted. The only other sentiment in the first resolution is "we will not as a body be responsible for the political doctrines of any member, or members of our Conference, or church, or party in the country." Taking away the latter clause of this part of the resolution as wholly irrelevant, we have the simple declaration that they are not responsible for the political doctrines of the members of the Conference and the Church.

We have declared that this resolution does not meet the question before the members of the church, or the public, in the least. One of the members of the Conference writes for six months, and fills all the papers in the Province with a defence of Sir C. Metcalfe, accompanied with the grossest abuse of the party opposed to him, one evident object being to influence the members of the church on his side of the question. The Church, and the public also, whom we believe have a voice in the question, call upon the Conference to make a declaration as to whether they are identified in the course of Mr. Ryerson; they admit the claim of the parties to an explanation, by giving the resolution in question. It is therefore either entirely evasive, or it decides the question; the latter we are inclined to conclude upon, for the following reasons:—

1st. The resolutions say, we are not responsible as a body for the political doctrines of members of the Conference and of the church.

What are political doctrines but political publications, intended to inculcate political principles? A person in the unmolested enjoyment of his private political opinions, cannot with propriety be said to have political doctrines: the essence of the expression is publication and teaching. If we are correct in our argument, the Conference is willing to permit the publication of political doctrines

by its members, but refuses as a body to be responsible for them. Whether they refuse to be responsible for them or not, they are so in the estimation of the public, and we believe of a majority of the members of the Church. We ask, Is the Conference responsible for the moral character of its members? Is it responsible for the efficiency of its members, in relation to their spiritual duties? They must say YES to these questions. How then can they say, we are not as a body responsible for the political doctrines of any member of our Conference or church, when the consequences of the interference of one of their members in political controversy, is both a depreciation of moral character and destructive of his efficiency as a preacher of the Gospel! Let any member of the Conference answer *this* if he can! This resolution involves the Conference in another contradiction. They have already decided that *The Christian Guardian*,—the organ of the Conference, shall not be a political journal,—while the individuals composing that Conference may interfere in the politics of the country in other journals, to any extent. Again, all of them together, or any of them, may not publish their political doctrines in their own paper; but every one separately, may fill all the papers in the Province with political articles.

This consequence undeniably follows, from allowing Mr. Ryerson to do so.

2ndly. It is evident that the decision of the Conference is in favour of Mr. Ryerson's conduct, from the pains taken to load the resolutions with the unnecessary declarations, that the Conference disclaim "all intention of controlling the political sentiments of any of our Ministers or members." Let us suppose the same question put before the Conference in England, in the presence of Mr. Wesley:—

Q. What is the judgment of this Conference in regard to the secular politics and parties of the day?

If the whole Conference did not stare with astonishment at the propounder, the answer would be, or perhaps shorter,—We have nothing to do with them. Look at the 11th of the twelve rules of a helper—

"You have nothing to do but to save souls."

This very rule is a part of the discipline of the Wesleyan Methodist church, and was, it seems, never thought of, but a merely irrelevant reply was given, which, if not decisive in favour of interference in politics, is not decisive against it.

3rdly. Because of the additional resolution, relative to the right to vote at elections. What reason is there for the Conference adding this article to a resolution on quite a different subject? We know of no other, than the existence, either of a tendency on their part to political interference, or a determination to support Mr. Ryerson's object; that, if he could not succeed in gaining the votes of the members, none should be lost to his side of the political question, if they could help it. Accordingly the public, and the officers of the Government appointed to execute a law of the Province, are told that the Methodist Conference will not consider any of

their Preachers deprived of their right to vote, who are not ordained according to the doctrines and discipline of their church.

This regulation carried into effect would secure the right to vote to all Preachers on trial, who, in the eye of the world and the law must be considered as clerical members of the community, who agreeably to the spirit of the law had no right to vote.

It would be absurd to attempt to force this distinction of the Conference on the return-officer; it would not be looked at for a moment. Why should the Conference be led so far into politics as to assume the right to dictate to the Executive Government, by interpreting an act of Parliament in its own favour? They have their Egerton Ryerson at the Governor's elbow, to see all right in the matter. If this is not a true way of accounting for the addition of the latter resolution, we request an explanation from those who can give one; and we shall be ready to qualify our present opinion accordingly. In noticing this disqualifying Act of Parliament, it is necessary to add, that we do not concur in the propriety or justice of it. We think that the deprivation of a vote personally, will have a tendency to make men more political than they otherwise would be. Having no direct personal influence they will endeavour to obtain it indirectly, and exercise it to the utmost extent. Perhaps this very enactment has had such an effect on the last election, as it formed a part of the grounds of complaint by Mr. Ryerson against the Reform Ministry. It has since been clearly proved that they had no more concern in it than Mr. Ryerson himself. We make this observation to shew another instance of the impropriety of his public interference in politics. He has charged the late Ministry with that which they had no concern in, and committed himself and the Conference, and the members to some extent, in opposition to truth—to the discredit of religion.

It was unwise, therefore, in the Conference to add the last of these resolutions, if they did not intend them to affect the elections—and if they did, it was unjust to one party, and a proof of their own interference in the politics of the day.

POLITICAL PREACHERS.

Extract from the Minutes of the Wesleyan Methodist Conference, held at Bristol, August 16, 1768:

Question—Shall itinerant Preachers follow trades?
Answer—This is an important question, and as it is the first time that it has come before us, it will be necessary to consider it thoroughly. The question is not whether they may occasionally work with their hands, as St. Paul did; but whether it be proper for them to keep shops, and follow merchandise. The plea that was urged for this was:—1. Necessity; 2. Doing more good. As to the first, Mr. Wesley proposed to supply all their necessities. As to the second plea,—doing more good; it was inquired, is it not doing evil that good may come? Is not the thing in question both evil in itself (for us) and evil in its consequences? 1. Is it not with regard to the Travelling Preachers evil in itself? Is it well consistent with that Scripture, 2 Tim. 2, 4:—*No man that warreth (i. e. takes on him the profession of a soldier, as we eminently do) entangleth himself with the affairs of this life, plainly referring to the Roman Law, which forbids any soldier to follow any other profession. Is it well consistent with that word, give attendance to reading, to exhortation, to teaching; meditate on these things, give thyself wholly to them, 1 Tim. 4, 13, 15. Can we be said to give ourselves wholly to these things, if we follow another profession? Dera not our Church in her office of*

ordination require every minister to do this? If they do it not, the more shame for them. We above all, should mind it, because every Travelling Preacher solemnly professes to have nothing else to do, and receives his little allowance for this very end. 2. Is it not evil in its consequences? Have not some ill consequences appeared already, and is there not the greatest reason to apprehend that still worse will follow? We are enjoined to give no offence either to Jew or Gentile, or to the Church of God. But this has already offended not only many of the world, but many of our own brethren. Many of the Preachers have been much grieved, yea, and those most alive to God. For if one Preacher follows trade, so may twenty; so may every one. And if any of them trade a little, why not ever so much, who can say how far he should go? Therefore we advise the Brethren who have been concerned hereto to give up all, and attend to the one business, and we doubt not that God will recompense him an hundred-fold, even in this world, as well as in the world to come." At the conference in 1770, it was agreed "that no Preacher, who would not relinquish his trade, &c., &c., should be considered a travelling Preacher any longer." From this time the evil was removed."

Though the interference in political controversy is not either mentioned or referred to, in the above extract, there are no scriptural authorities or reasons produced, why Preachers should not follow trades, but which equally prove that they should not interfere with political controversy.

There is no reason to believe that the same decision would not have been given in the same conference if there had been cause for it; but there was none.—It is not a practice with the Preachers in England to interfere in current party politics.—It never was. The few cases in which they have written on subjects which may be called political subjects, in some sense, are not even exceptions to this assertion. We would respectfully ask the Preachers of the Wesleyan Methodist Church, to apply these scriptures and reasons to the conduct of the Rev. Egerton Ryerson, and say if they can justify his conduct.

With regard to those portions of the scriptures referred to in the preceding extract from the English Conference, there is no question whatever that their application is as direct and unequivocal as language can make it. The reasons are equally so:—If Mr. Ryerson can take up the current politics of the day, and fill all the papers of the Province with his writings on public affairs, why may not twenty, nay, why may not all the Preachers do the same? If Mr. Ryerson may do so much, why may not all do a little in the same way? and if all may do a little, why may they not all do as much? Who (says the immortal Wesley) can tell how far he ought to go? We recommend the acceptance of this advice from their revered Founder, to the brethren in Canada—"to give up all, and attend to the one business." That the evil consequences mentioned in the foregoing extract have also happened in Canada, is shown by the following letter which appeared in the Provincial Papers a few months ago:—

[The Letter showing the injury inflicted deferred for want of space.]

From the St. Catharines Journal.

The first number of the "Toronto Periodical Journal, or Wesleyan Methodist," has appeared, and is to be continued till the next sitting of Conference, having for its object the obtaining from that body a strong declaration against the interference of its members with politics, and the bringing about of a lay representation therein—arising from Mr. Ryerson's conduct and the action of Conference upon it. On the first subject it says:—

"It in the next session of Conference some declaration on this subject satisfactory to all the members of the Church, be not made, disagreeing and

dissatisfaction will ensue of the most pernicious consequences, and which must result in the organization of another Methodist Church, entirely neuter as to politics."

It is stated of this journal, that "the profit if any, will be appropriated for the benefit of the church;" the church, we suppose, which is to result from Conference not making a "declaration" "a satisfaction to all the members."

These are pretty strong signs of a schism in the Wesleyan body, and which we do not think there is sufficient reason for. Mr. Ryerson and his writings might be allowed an oblivion, and those who are offended at the past might seek quiet in the pale of another church—we believe in the Methodist New Connexion the system of lay representation exists—without agitating the formation of a new sect, now so many as to be "past count."

The Editor of the St. Catharines Journal, in noticing the first appearance of our paper, makes the remarks inserted in the above extract. We are quite sure, that our esteemed contemporary, did not intentionally misrepresent us, as we know him to be incapable of doing so. If he will refer to our prospectus, he will find that the quotation is very unfairly made. The paragraph concluded with a short sentence, which, if attended to, rendered it impossible to deduce such consequences as he has from the language of that article. That sentence is—"A result exceedingly disastrous, and which our most strenuous efforts shall be made to prevent." We will thank our contemporary, to do us justice by inserting the whole of the paragraph referred to.

From the tenor of his remarks, we have an impression that our contemporary is not the author of them. They contain insinuations neither generous nor charitable—to the effect that the profits of our Journal, were to be appropriated for an intended Church, one not in existence. This is an inference not warranted by any language used by us, and which we believe our cotemporary incapable of making. They contain also an indication of the resistance with which our demand is to be met, a subject we believe, which is a little out of his province. Neither would he, in our opinion, recommend a division of the Wesleyan Methodist Church, or an accession to the New Connexion. This irony of the writer, and those insinuations as to the honesty of our intention, bespeak a weak defence against the charges which truth and love for the church of our choice, render necessary to be made against some members of the Conference. We inform him, that we have every reason to believe, that we shall succeed in the object we have undertaken, with honesty of purpose, and on grounds of proved necessity.

A declaration must issue from the Conference, to satisfy the members of the church, and even the community generally, neither of whom will tolerate a political priesthood. Methodism must be delivered from this bane, both of civil and religious liberty, or, it will be the interest of the whole community, to wish the name of methodist, banished from the Province and forgotten.

LAY REPRESENTATION.

We commence the discussion of the propriety of introducing the principle of lay representation in the Wesleyan Methodist Conference, by offering the following propositions for the serious consideration of our readers. Some of them are self-evident

arms are generally known to be true and require no arguments; the remainder we presume also to be true, but we shall be open to conviction, in relation to all that may be brought against them.

We shall have much more to say on a future occasion on all these propositions, as well as on the right of members of Churches to take part in the management of them, and on the advantages in general, of lay representation. We invite the attention of the members of the Wesleyan Methodist Church to these propositions, and doubt not that a majority of them will be of our opinion, that the only remedy for the abuses we have pointed out, is Lay-Representation:—

1. That the Conference of the Wesleyan Methodist Church in Canada, has assumed the power to govern the Church, in all matters, spiritual and secular.

2. That this power originated with Methodism, under its revered Founder, the Rev. John Wesley, who never abused it; and that it is peculiar to Methodism as a private religious Society.

3. That in consequence of the above peculiarity, the exercise of such power in England does not violate individual rights.

4. That the Wesleyan Methodist Church in Canada is not a private Society, but a Church founded on the principles of primitive Christianity, and the Word of God.

5. That while the Methodist Episcopal Church in the United States, and the Wesleyan Methodist Church and the original Methodist body differ in many things, one of them is no less properly and efficiently a Methodist body than the other.

6. That the original Methodist body in England, was, from its origin, distinguished as receiving no support from the State, and for total abstinence from all interference in the politics of the day.

7. That the Conference of the Wesleyan Methodist Church has received money from the Government for its support as a Church, in addition to support for its Missionary operations, and avows an opinion of the propriety of doing so.

8. That the official organ of the Conference, the "Christian Guardian" has interfered in the political controversies of the day, almost from its commencement in 1839.

9. That the Rev. Egerton Ryerson has been most prominently engaged in political controversy, as Editor of the *Guardian*; and as a minister of the Church, has written on both sides of the various controversies that have arisen, and made paranzans on both sides alternately; that he has been the principal agent in all negotiations with the Government to obtain money for the Church, and the principal medium of connection, whereby the Colonial Office and the Government have exercised political influence on the Members of the Wesleyan Methodist Church. He has also been considered the leader of the few that have ruled the Conference almost from its existence.

10. That for political purposes, by the influence chiefly of Mr. Ryerson, and without consulting the members of the Church, the following changes have taken place:—A dissolution of connection between the Methodist Episcopal Church of the United States and the Canadian Ministers thereof, and a union between the latter and the British Conference, and a dissolution of the same.

11. That these unions and separations have been detrimental to religion, and have inflicted injury on many persons who would have otherwise continued united.

12. That on the dissolution of the latter union the usual Government allowances in aid of missionary undertakings remained unpaid, and still remain unpaid, either to the Wesleyan Methodist Church, or to the Agents of the British Conference. This sum, £700 sterling per annum, due since 1810, is now about £900 currency, and is kept in abeyance for the party who can contribute most political influence to the Government.

13. That in addition to the Missionary money for which the Conference depend on the Government, they receive £700 per annum for Victoria College, and are seeking more, as well as a portion of the Clergy Reserves.

14. That if the members of the Church were consulted, they would prefer to renounce the above, and all other descriptions of Government aid rather than endanger the efficiency of the Ministry.

15. That every description of Government aid, by money or patronage destroys the efficiency of the Ministry: that seeking support partly from the Government, and partly from the members of the Church, weakens the claim of the ministry on both, and induces the people to contribute as much as is

16. That the members of the Church are both able and willing to support all the institutions of Methodism without Government aid.

17. That the *Christian Guardian* does not represent the opinions of the members of the Wesleyan Methodist Church, in relation to the matters of the preceding propositions.

18. That the Rev. Egerton Ryerson has been hired to defend Sir Charles Metcalfe's political conduct, with a view of influencing the votes of the members of the Wesleyan Methodist Church; and has been rewarded with a public office with a salary of £375 per annum; is enabled to go to Europe at the expense either of the Government or Sir Charles Metcalfe, having the prospect of an increased grant of money for Victoria College.

19. That the Conference has identified itself with the conduct of Mr. Ryerson.

20. That the uncontrollable power assumed by the leaders of the Conference, in placing themselves, as Churchmen, over their Brethren; in appropriating, towards their salaries large sums out of the Missionary Funds; and in controlling the Chapel Property, are sufficient to excite the distrust of the whole Connection; and fear, that, whilst Dr Ryerson is at their head, they may depart from Methodist doctrine and discipline whenever they may think proper.

The above propositions, some immediately and some more remotely connected with the subject of Lay-Representation, we shall enter upon, and endeavour to prove, from time to time, as we have space, or are called upon to do. Most happy should we be if we could reduce the number and magnitude of the charges seeming to lie against the Conference, and calling for the interference of every well-wisher to Methodism to aid in putting a stop to such abuses.

These propositions form the basis of our argument in favour of Lay-Representation. If they are proved, it will be evident the leaders of the Conference of the Wesleyan Methodist Church are no longer entitled to the confidence of the people. It is well known the leaders of the Conference have resisted one official application from the members on the subject of Mr. Ryerson's public interference in political controversy; that they close the columns of the *Christian Guardian* to appeals both from preachers and members on the subject, not according with the views of the small governing party in the Conference, and that they both write and labour for state support, and to reciprocate with political influence. They do this in the prospect of a prosperous age of the Church, which specially requires an entire renunciation of state support, and a complete separation of the clergy from all political matters, as to public interference in them—at a time when other Churches make it their true glory to depend ALONE on the Head of the Church, for all spiritual help—and on themselves, for all temporal necessities. Let it not be thought, that while the spirit breathes those cheering words to the Church in the present day. Awake! Awake! put on thy strength O Zion, put on thy beautiful garments O Jerusalem, that it could be said to the once pure and faithful Methodist ministry. Come down and sit in the dust, O Virgin daughter of Babylon!

They are burdened with a load of the secular affairs of the Church, busied from day to day, in cringing to government for money, and offer the voices of their members in return. They forget that they could be relieved of a great amount of secular labour which is necessary to be done by dividing it, and the responsibility also with the leading official members, by admitting them to the first

beginning of the Christian Religion. They see the whole country excited, as to the conduct of one of their body—they see him held up as "the hircling and apostate Priest" They see him throw himself with unhallowed fury into the angry political turmoil. They see him rewarded, and share in the reward. The managers of the "Wesleyan Methodist" see no remedy for this, but a lay-representation, and that not with the object of ruling the Clergy, but of being placed in a position to prevent the ruin of the Church.

These considerations and deductions only show the abuse of power, and the necessity for preventing it in future, but from the same propositions may be inferred the right of the members of the Church to interfere in its management. Also on grounds of love to religion, which they possess as well as ministers, and of regard for their families, and for posterity in general; though they are not so bigoted as to think their own denomination better in all respects than others; it is at least one branch of the Church, which they would be the last to see injured—one star in the spiritual Heavens which they would be the last to see fall; being equally interested with the Preachers, they have equally a right to assist in the government of the Church.

We have now proved the abuses of power on the part of the Conference.

We have proved hitherto, their refusal to regard the opinions of the members of the Church.

We have proved that there have been departures from original Methodism, which have been necessary, justifiable, and resulting in great good without violating any of the essential principles of Methodism, and we demand now, either or all of the following things:—A declaration from the Conference, that henceforth the Church shall refuse government aid, whether in relation to Victoria College, to missionary operations,—or the Clergy Reserves, that it should rely only on the people. That henceforth no minister shall enter into public controversy on the party politics of the day.

That no member of the Conference shall hold any situation of private emolument under the Government, and remain a member of the Conference.

That the *Christian Guardian*, shall not be a vehicle for party politics in any degree, that it shall not interfere either editorially or indirectly, by the contents of its pages.

That the mode of settlement of the Chapels agreeable to the pattern given in the discipline, shall not be altered.

Should the Conference decline immediate assent to all or any of these demands, we demand to see a rational defence, such as may satisfy those who are at present alarmed, to show if possible, that it is not necessary at present to make an alteration in the Constitution of the Church, by introducing the principle of lay-representation.

If these demands are complied with, it is probable that the confidence of the members of the Church may be restored, and become permanent. If they are denied, the whole Church and the Province too, will receive such a refusal, as the most unequivocal admission of the charges now brought against

the Conference, and of a determination to become when they can, a State-supported Church; by which it becomes inevitable, the Conference will be dependent on the Government, and subservient, and independent of the people. Two of the greatest evils that have afflicted the Christian Church since the days of Constantine, and the sure precursors of its spiritual and moral degradation.

Temperance Olio.—We have received a communication relative to the performances at the Temperance Olio, which was attended by some of the leading Ministers of the Methodist Church in this city, about a month since.

Having made enquiries, we find that the Temperance Committee have discommenced these performances, as being of a despising tendency, the music consisting in part, of the trilling songs of the Theatricals of the day. We are not sure that those ministers who were aware of the nature of the performers they were patronizing in their laudible zeal for temperance. As we believe that such attendance now its character is known, will not be repeated, we shall not publish the communication referred to. However, the cause of Temperance *versus* Religion, requires watching.

The following resolutions have been passed at an official meeting of the official members of the Wesleyan Methodist Church at Newmarket. We trust the example will be followed in every circuit and station in Western Canada, at the Quarterly meeting previous to the Annual Conference.

Whitchurch, January 7th, 1845.

Mr. BALLANTYNE.—Enclosed I send you for publication in "the Wesleyan Methodist," a preamble and two resolutions recently adopted by the members of the Wesleyan Methodist Church, on the Newmarket Circuit.

They were originally moved in the regular Quarterly Meeting by Mr. Finlay McFarlane, and seconded by Mr. John Garton, but the Chairman, (who by the way was not the Chairman of the District but employed in his absence,) did not feel himself at liberty to offer them for a vote, as he thought they were contrary to the discipline of our Church; however he very kindly allowed the mover to offer them upon his own responsibility; when they were carried in the affirmative by a vote of *twelve to two*.

They are as follows:—
PREAMBLE.
 Whereas, we, the Members of the Newmarket Quarterly Meeting, possess a lively interest in the prosperity of the Church on this Circuit, and also throughout the connexion, we feel deeply pained at some circumstances of recent occurrence, which in our humble judgment have a tendency to destroy the tranquillity of the membership of the Church, and to produce a recurrence of those unhappy and ever to be lamented divisions, which have, of late, disturbed our peace and prosperity.

Therefore, **Resolved**,—That, for the purpose of preventing a continuance of the existing evils, and also to avoid the danger of others which may arise, we recommend the plan of having each circuit throughout the connexion represented in the Annual Conference by as many lay delegates as there are ordained preachers on the same.

Resolved, Secondly,—That the foregoing resolutions be published in the public journals.

JOSEPH HARTMAN,
Recording Steward,
 Newmarket Circuit.

Mr. Ballantyne,
 Publisher of "The Wesleyan Methodist."

NOTICES BY THE PRESS.

Toronto Periodical Journal, or Wesleyan Methodist.—The first number of this new Monthly Journal has just appeared, and from its character we are inclined to believe that it will occupy an important place in the field of our provincial literature. It is printed on a beautiful English paper, and as to size and appearance bears a strong resemblance to the earlier editions of Chambers' Edinburgh Journal, with this exception that the type is larger. The design of the publication, as detailed by its conductor in his enlarged prospectus, cannot fail to commend the work to the favour of that class for whose interest and welfare it has been especially projected, while the general character and spirit which pervades its columns give it a strong claim to the countenance and support of all the friends of religious liberty. The intention is to issue the paper for six months, or until the next sitting of the Methodist Conference, but we hope that the important bearing which such a publication must have upon the interests of what is called the Lay in the community, will secure for it a permanent footing

amongst them. The price is 2s. 6d. currency for the six months, payable in advance.—*Examiner*

Toronto Periodical Journal or Wesleyan Methodist.—We have received the first number of a new monthly periodical, under the above title. It is stated by the Editor that it had been commenced in consequence of the Rev. Egerton Ryerson's interfering in political controversy to such an extent as to raise the greatest apprehensions of a division in the church, that "the projectors of the *Wesleyan Methodist* consider there are sufficient reasons for its establishment, and good grounds on which to hope for general circulation among the members of the Methodist Church, and of the attendants on the Methodist ministry whose numbers form an important portion of the population. At a random estimate we suppose their number not to be under 120,000." The principal object for issuing this paper is declared to be to discuss the propriety of a lay representation in the Conference, to which, it appears, the members of the Church have no access but through their minister. This periodical is well got up, and breathes the spirit of attachment to the great principles of civil and religious liberty. Most cordially do we wish it an extensive circulation, for we are certain, if it is conducted as well as the first number, it will cause the scales to drop from many eyes.—*Banner*.

We have received the first number of the "*Wesleyan Methodist*," a new journal just started in Toronto. It is to be published once a month until next Conference, or longer if necessary, price 2s. 6d. for six months. The work has been begun in consequence of Mr. Ryerson's political crusade, and it advocates a representation of the people in the Conference, as the only means of correcting such wanderings in the ministers. It is certain that if the people had been represented in the Conference Mr. Ryerson would not have been allowed to pursue a course of violent political agitation without censure.—*Kingston Herald*

[We have received additional notices of our paper from the *Toronto Mirror*, the *Montreal Pilot*, and the *Pictou Spectator*, which are omitted for want of space. We return thanks to our friends of the Press for their courtesy and good wishes for our success.]

From the *Examiner*, December 4.

It appears to us that the public leaders of any society whatever, who profess to be its representatives, should not desire to hide themselves behind the bulwark of legal forms and technicalities, when official character is concerned, but that with a ready and unsuspecting frankness, any public expression of misapprehension, concerning their conduct or motives, should at once be met and explained. In accordance with this sentiment, we cannot but view the following language of our cotemporary as unjust towards our correspondents, and in very bad taste. It is a vulgar reflection against individuals, members of the Methodist Church, the character of whose communications deserve more than common courtesy at his hands:—

"If any of our members have complaints against individual ministers of their own body, it is not their duty, and it is entirely against the rule and usage of the Church to publish complaints in the public papers,—which are, unhappily, too ready for the reception of *that bad ferment coming from the sour stomachs* of discontented, and, therefore, unhappy men."

Our correspondents are here declared to be discontented and unhappy—this we believe from the nature of their correspondence; but an individual is not to be blamed for being discontented, and he deserves our sympathy if he is unhappy. The lover of religion and virtue will be discontented and unhappy amid scenes of irreligion and vice. The friend of truth, consistency, and official fidelity, will be discontented and unhappy when those great and important principles are sacrificed at the shrine of worldly policy or ambition. And it is neither charitable, just nor wise, to refer such discontent and unhappiness, as the editor of the *Guardian* has done, in the very inelegant language to which we have referred, to "*that bad ferment coming from sour stomachs*," instead of referring it to its more probable source, the honest indignation of an upright mind against an evil of great magnitude and danger.

Upon a careful review of the various and weighty matters referred to in the correspondence of "*a Wesleyan Methodist*," and the article in the *Guardian* now under consideration, intended, we presume, as an official reply to it; we should say, as an impartial journalist, that while the latter tends only to confirm the truth of the charges contained in the former, it has elicited also principles which, in our opinion, are subversive of the freedom of public discussion,—subversive of the freedom or utility of the Press. The *Guardian* deems *silence* a virtue in the present case:—Is it the silent admission of facts, the silent allowance of the inferences which every intelligent and virtuous mind must draw from them?

We give the above opinion from *The Examiner*, on the subject of the correspondence that has already taken place between that journal's Correspondent and the *Christian Guardian*. We are astonished at the man-

ner in which the latter paper is conducted. The want of refinement displayed in the use of the almost indecent figure resorted to in the above extract, shews a mind destitute of taste and judgment, and unfit for the management of a journal conducted for the benefit of the Methodist community; unless it is intended to be understood that they are not sufficiently refined to be able to appreciate better language. Equally deficient in judgment must that mind be that admits the existence of unhappiness and discontent in the people whom it is the exclusive duty of the Conference to secure in the enjoyment of contentment and happiness,—an admission of incapacity and inefficiency in relation to the objects of ministerial and editorial labour, that we did not expect. Why do not the Conference give up their Ministry at once, rather than submit to the humiliation of telling the world that they hold ecclesiastical rule over discontented and unhappy men! Another instance of the want of refinement and of incapacity is seen in the correspondence in the present number. A minister of religion, instead of replying to a charge, calls the document containing it a "*fool thing!*" This is much easier than answering arguments and opposing facts. On another occasion, the issue is placed on his veracity, which he says he will "*surrender to no man.*" We do not see why he should, and we would be as much afflicted as himself to see his veracity surrendered. But has he never reflected that the veracity of his opponent is as dear to him as that of the Rev. assenter.

We protest against being called on to decide on the questions in dispute in reference to the veracity of the parties. No one of cultivated mind, and honorable feeling, would place the issue on such grounds. We are ashamed of the assumption of superior veracity, which is the real thing implied, when evidence is within reach to prevent the necessity of such an appeal. In another place we have brought forward the principles on which the introduction of Lay-representation is based, and among them we have hinted at the fact, that the present deed of settlement for the Chapel property being incomplete, there is a danger of the greatest innovations in Methodism that could be thought of. Surely exclusive use is enough, as it is in England, without having the property vested in themselves also? If this will not open the eyes of the members of the church, nothing will. We have only to conceive the possibility of Mr. Ryerson's return from England with fresh impressions either as an Episcopalian, Puseyite, or Mormon, for it is impossible to depend on him; and in conjunction with the absolute ownership of the Chapel Property, with his power over the Conference, he may do any thing. There is in this circumstance no security whatever for the integrity, purity & permanence of Methodism in Canada, under the management of the leaders of the Conference of the Wesleyan Methodist Church. This is sufficient to rouse every member of the Wesleyan Methodist church in the Province—an innovation fertile in evil, and the sure precursor of the extinction of Methodism in Canada. When the Conference have the pro-

party they can do what they please; they can abolish Class Meetings, as was once attempted by the modest Doctor, alter the Discipline and Doctrines of the church; and the community will have no alternative, but to withdraw as private individuals and find rest in some other Evangelical branch of the Church of Christ. What is the organ of the Conference about, that it either cannot, or dare not answer to the serious charges, brought against the Conference? If this silence continues a little longer, the verdict of the membership, and of the whole people of Canada, will be one of unqualified condemnation against the Conference. Not to be misunderstood with reference to the party intended by the word Conference, we mean the ruling power in that body, which, at most, does not exceed nine persons. By no means do we intend the majority of upright and spiritually minded men, who are too seriously devoted to their work to be a match for the political, ambitious, and, we fear, sinister minded few. That majority is the hope of the Methodist Church at this critical time, and if they do their duty all will be well.

We are aware that we have already been misrepresented as to our intentions in issuing this publication. Perhaps from announcing that we should continue it for six months to await the decision of the next Conference, we have given some appearance of reality to the notion, that if *then* we failed in our object, we should make a division in the church. We repeat, our object is not division; we have no reason to have such an object, so far from it that the whole church will shortly rise and protest with us against the abuse of power by the leaders of the Conference, and admit that our objects are conservative of Methodism, while those who oppose us are ensuring its destruction.

The communication from our esteemed correspondent at Cobourg is hereby acknowledged. We cannot insert it entire at present, but we shall reply to the main question therein put and inform him that the Memorial from the official members of the Toronto City Station, sent to the Conference held in Brockville in June last, was the result of an official meeting in the most accurate sense of the word.

On that occasion the Chairman of the District, and Superintendent of the Circuit, and now the Secretary of the Conference presided, all which offices are held by the Rev. H. Wilkinson. He further gave it his sanction by suggesting the Postscript himself. This we hope is enough to meet the unexpected and groundless assertion that the Memorial in question possesses no official character.

Missionary Collections.—The letter, signed "A Subscriber," is excluded for want of space, but we reply to its questions. We regret to say, that it is too true that the Missionary Money is being appropriated towards the Salaries of Chancellors of Districts. We believe such appropriation to be neither agreeable to the usage and discipline of the Church nor to good policy. As to the third question, "Whether such an appropriation is announced from the Missionary platform when the collections are made?" we reply, we do not know. On this the honesty of the transaction depends. The people ought, surely, to know on such occasions whether they are contributing

to ordinary funerals or supporting Missionaries to the Aborigines and destitute settlers.

The Methodist Establishment.—A few days ago, a special messenger from the College at Cobourg, came to require the immediate attendance of Mr. John Ryerson at the Seat of Government in order to secure the grant to Victoria College, as there was a danger of losing it for want of an influential person there. We are at a loss to know why the President of the Conference was not sent, perhaps none but a Ryerson would be influential. Such is the employment of Methodist Preachers, and such the reward of the Doctor's labours in politics.

Wesleyan and Episcopal Methodists.—The Baltimore Sun gives the following account of a secession from the Methodist Episcopal Church that has taken place, which is now organized under the title of Wesleyan Methodists. They held the first general Conference at Cleveland a short time since, and remained in session nine days. The principal points of difference between the two bodies are, 1. The Wesleyans admit laymen as members to their annual and general conferences,—the Episcopal Methodists exclude them entirely. 2. Among the Wesleyans the people are permitted to some extent to elect their ministers; among the Episcopal Methodists they are appointed by the Bishops. 3. The Wesleyans have no bishops. Their rules require all members to adopt the principles of anti-slavery, and not to use or traffic in ardent spirits. They are about to establish a paper and a book concern in the city of New York; and the True Wesleyan a paper which has hitherto been published by the Rev. O. Scott, is to be transferred to New York.—*New York Weekly Sun.*

THE TREE IS KNOWN BY ITS FRUIT, OR THE STREAMS SHOW WHAT THE FOUNTAIN IS:—

THE TREE

The Seizure of Messrs. Smith's Distillery.—The seizure by direction of her Majesty's Commissioners of Excise, of the extensive distillery and rectifying-house, outbuildings, plant, &c., of Messrs. Smith, of Whitechapel, has been carried into effect by four chief examiners of excise, aided by several inferior officers. This further step has not only created a great sensation amongst the numerous tavern-keepers and proprietors of spirit establishments in the metropolis and suburbs, but has also given rise to much conversation in the commercial and monetary circles. From the best information that can be obtained upon the subject, it appears, that in consequence of the Excise Commissioners having for some time past suspected—upon what grounds have not transpired beyond the firm retailing spirits at a superior strength and lower price than other distillers—that Messrs. Smith, have not been in the habit of accounting for the full amount of duty payable upon their stock, the Board of Excise ordered that a most vigilant watch should be kept upon their establishments. For some time past, an excise officer had been appointed to be constantly upon the premises, and the workmen of Messrs. Smith were forbidden to hold any communication with him on pain of dismissal. The first step adopted against the firm was about three months since, when the Excise seized twenty puncheons of gin, and conveyed them to the government stores in Broad-Street; but upon the subsequent representations of Messrs. Smith, the Commissioners ordered fifteen of the number, with their contents, to be returned. The remaining five were retained for the purposes of ulterior proceedings. In the meantime, reports were from time to time made to the Commissioners of the operations carried forward at the distillery and rectifying house, and consultations were held by the legal advisers of the Board with the Solicitor-General and other eminent members of the bar, which led to the determination on the part of the Commissioners to have recourse to energetic and decisive measures. The details of the legal conferences have not been suffered to transpire, and in all probability will not reach the public eye until the whole matter comes on for public hearing before the Barons of the Court of Exchequer. The object, however, which the Commissioners had in view, may be gathered from the fact that officers and others had been employed to dig up the paving stones around Messrs. Smith's extensive premises, and pipes have been discovered concealed about three feet from the surface of the earth, connecting the distillery with the rectifying-house, which is contrary to the provisions of the various Acts of Parliament regulating such matters. The Commissioners having ordered a complete stoppage of the works, the distillery now presents a gloomy and wretched contrast, to the active bustling scene which it presented when in working order, and the deep trenches dug out in front and around it, exposing the objectionable pipes to view, are objects daily of increased public attention. The loss to the firm, by the stoppage of the works, must be a severe one, and Messrs. Smith have been in the habit of paying to Government for duty alone, between £3,000,000

and £4,000,000 per annum. Every portion of the monster establishment has had the broad arrow affixed to it, and not a cask, waggon, or utensil has escaped the same mark of condemnation at the excise-man's hands. Above sixty workmen, it was stated, were discharged on Saturday night last, making the number, including those dismissed on the previous week, above 120 now out of employment. Messrs. Smith have menaced the Lords of the Treasury on the subject, their Lordships' reply is looked for with great interest. The buildings alone are estimated to be of the value of £100,000, and should the Board of Excise succeed in the Court of Exchequer, in recovering the enormous penalties for which the firm are being prosecuted, the whole of this valuable property will fall into the hands of the Crown, and a rich harvest will be reaped by the officers who have assisted in promoting the proceedings. In any event, Messrs. Smith will be put to very heavy expenses in resisting the Crown prosecutions.

THE FRUIT.

A Victim of Gin.—A wretched woman, named Ann Navy, the unfortunate victim of gin, was brought before the Lord Mayor of London, on Thursday, charged with having attempted to strangle herself with her bonnet strings. Thomas Balchin (city policeman) stated, that on Wednesday, having been informed that a female had attempted to destroy herself at the corner of Widgegate street, Bishopsgate, he found the prisoner black in the face in consequence of having tried to strangle herself with her bonnet ribbons. When she recovered from her insensibility, she said she had made the attempt because she had murdered her mother. The agony of her mind was so intense as completely to damage her intellect. She was placed under the judicious care of Mr. Macmurdo, who signified in a note to the Lord Mayor, that, when she was first conveyed to the Compter, she acted in the most violent manner, and it was absolutely necessary to force the victuals down her throat; that she had since become more calm, but was very weak; and that her condition was attributable to excessive drinking. The Lord Mayor: what are you, prisoner? The prisoner:—I have no home, but I have been employed in the book business, in Jewin-present. The Lord Mayor: What did you mean by saying you had murdered your mother?—The prisoner:—I consider that I did murder her. I broke her heart by my wickedness. That's murder. The Lord Mayor: When did she die? The prisoner:—One day last week, in Bishopsgate Union Workhouse. The Lord Mayor:—Are you sure that if I send to the Workhouse, I shall be informed of her death?—The prisoner: Certainly. There is no doubt of her death, and I was the cause of it, I was so wicked. The Lord Mayor, in what respect were you wicked? The prisoner: By drinking.—The Lord Mayor: Have you a father, or brothers, or sisters?—The prisoner: No, they are all dead. The last person I lived with was my sister, who has died since. She was obliged to turn me out on account of my dreadful propensity. The Lord Mayor: How do you know she is dead? The prisoner: I heard so. She lived in Red Lion Court, Fleet Street. I have been the cause of dreadful misery.—The Lord Mayor: Have you ever received parish relief?—The prisoner: Never. I have been able to support myself by book work, in which I have been regularly brought up.

The Earliest Living Creatures on Earth.

—And what were those creatures? It well might be with a kind of awe that the uninstructed inquirer would wait for an answer to this question. But nature is simpler, than man's will would make her, and behold the interrogation only brings before us the unpretending forms of various zoophytes and polypes, together with a few single and double-valved shell-fish (mollusks), all of them creatures of the sea. It is rather surprising to find these before any vegetable forms considering that vegetables appear to us as forming the necessary first link in the chain of nutrition; but it is probable that there were sea plants, and also some simpler forms of animal life, before this period, although too slight a substance to have any fossil trace of their existence.—*Natural History of Creation.*

The Mind of Man.—We have faculties in full force and activity, which the animals either possess not at all, or in so low and obscure a form as to be equivalent to non-existence. Now these parts of mind are those which connect us with the things which are not of this world. We have veneration prompting us to the Worship of the Deity, which the animals lack. We have hope to carry us on in thought beyond the bounds of time. We have reason, to enable us to inquire into the character of the Great Father, and the relation of us, his humble creatures towards him. We have conscientiousness and benevolence, by which we can, in a faint and humble measure imitate in our conduct, that which he exemplifies in the whole of his wondrous doings. Beyond this, mental science does not carry us in support of religion: the rest depends on evidence of a different kind. But it is surely much that we thus discover in nature a provision for things so important. The existence of faculties having a regard to such things is a good evidence that such things exist. The face of God is reflected in the organization of man, as a little pool reflects the glorious sun.—*Id.*