

**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

Coloured pages/  
Pages de couleur

Covers damaged/  
Couverture endommagée

Pages damaged/  
Pages endommagées

Covers restored and/or laminated/  
Couverture restaurée et/ou pelliculée

Pages restored and/or laminated/  
Pages restaurées et/ou pelliculées

Cover title missing/  
Le titre de couverture manque

Pages discoloured, stained or foxed/  
Pages décolorées, tachetées ou piquées

Coloured maps/  
Cartes géographiques en couleur

Pages detached/  
Pages détachées

Coloured ink (i.e. other than blue or black)/  
Encre de couleur (i.e. autre que bleue ou noire)

Showthrough/  
Transparence

Coloured plates and/or illustrations/  
Planches et/ou illustrations en couleur

Quality of print varies/  
Qualité inégale de l'impression

Bound with other material/  
Relié avec d'autres documents

Continuous pagination/  
Pagination continue

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

Includes index(es)/  
Comprend un (des) index

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

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.

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"/>

# PERIODICAL TORONTO JOURNAL

OR, WESLEYAN METHODIST.

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

VOL. I.

TORONTO, APRIL, 1845.

No. 4.

**THE TORONTO PERIODICAL JOURNAL;** or, WESLEYAN METHODIST, published under the Superintendance 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.

#### NOTICE TO CORRESPONDENTS.

Many of our correspondents do not seem to have noticed the discontinuance of the name of Mr. Ballantyne as the publisher of our journal. We refer you to our notice in the February number. We also take the opportunity of stating explicitly, that the editor never assumed the name of Ballantyne. The address is, "The Editor of the Toronto Periodical Journal, or, Wesleyan Methodist, No. 57 Box, Post-Office." All communications to be post-paid.

## THE WESLEYAN METHODIST.

"When preachers of the Gospel become parties in party politics, religious mourns, the Church is wounded, and political disputes agitate even the faithful of the Lord. 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."—*Lift of Dr. Adam Clarke.*

TORONTO, APRIL, 1845.

### TO OUR SUBSCRIBERS.

We hereby acknowledge the receipt of communications since our last publication, with those containing notifications of new subscribers, and remittances from the following places; Clarendon, Belleville, Yonge, Aylmer, L. C., Brantford, Chatham, Hamilton, Mount Pleasant, Dundas, Bytown, Perth, Barrie, Prescott, Brockville, Drummondville, and Matilda. All of which have been attended to.

With reference to one from Brantford, by some accident, we suppose, of the Post-office, a letter dated December 24, with remittance, was only received on the 15th of March.

We have now had an expression of opinion as to the object of our journal from nearly every part of the province, and we are happy to announce to our readers that the number of subscribers considerably exceeds our estimate in the first instance. From some, we have been solicited to publish a semi-monthly journal, at an advance of price, which of course would be an unavoidable consequence; to which we can only say, at present, that we are anxious to please the majority, and to give our distant subscribers the opportunity of expressing their opinion on this question before we can decide on the form, and as to the periods of publication, on the termination of the six months of our contract with present subscribers.

We therefore request our subscribers for the first six months, who have not remitted their subscriptions to do so as soon as convenient, we also request them, and others, to send their subscriptions for the whole year to terminate with the December number of 1845.

The impression increasingly prevails that a species of lay-representation is actually in operation, as long as this journal is circulated; for it is hardly to be expected that the Conference will not readily remove all abuses, and yield to the wishes of the people to an extent corresponding to the number of the members of the Church who call upon them to do so. We therefore intend to continue the publication of this journal; not one year, we hope, but for an indefinite term, and to throw ourselves on the members of the Church for support, on the principle that the members should have a journal to advocate and express their opinions before the community in general, as well as to the Conference, as long as the Christian Guardian remains the exclusive organ of the Conference.

of complaint should be met by the Conference in a spirit of honourable concession, when necessary, and of general friendly demeanor, towards that portion of the members who hold the opinions expressed in this journal, there will doubtless be profitable employment for our paper in the circulation of additional religious knowledge, and in watching over the interests of the community in the position it has assumed, and that harmoniously with all other connexional agencies. The pledge given in the first number, that the profits of this journal will be given to the connexional funds, will be adhered to. Private gain will not be made of it. If it is sustained to an extent more than to pay expenses, the surplus will be announced, and handed over to be applied to the general good.

To give our readers some notion of the prevalence of opinion in favour of our journal generally, and on the subject of lay-representation, we refer to a few extracts from letters received since our last publication. With a subscription for two copies, and remittance, the writer concludes,—"Wishing you every success in your laudable endeavours, to advance the cause of Christian Liberty."

Another writes,—"I consider it to be Providential that this publication has appeared at this peculiarly important period, in the history of our Church. I approve of the spirit in which the various articles have been written, (I mean editorial.) I sincerely applaud the object you have in view as one of great importance to the Church in reference to its future peace and prosperity. The project of a lay-delegation is gaining friends rapidly in this quarter."

Another writes,—"My own opinion now is, that lay-representation is absolutely necessary to save us from ruin."

The last extract refers to the subject of sending out improper preachers. Have the Conference not done this? They will find a suitable reply in referring to significant intimations in another part of our paper. We are confident of our position in this respect, and coincide with our correspondent, that lay-representation, alone, seems to give us the prospect of being saved from ruin.

Another writer says (and a very important extract it is) "the very able writer in the Examiner, Nov. 13, 1844, we all believe to be not only well written, but true, and although denied, it has never been disproved." further, the same writer says:—"the views of all our people here, with reference to the chapel property are, that they want it decided to the people, or in some way that the Conference will have no claim on it, and they like the idea of lay-delegation, and appear to have lost confidence in the preachers, as they say, they have betrayed the people several times and are not worthy of having confidence placed in them again. We think the secular affairs of the Connection ought to be managed by a majority of lay-members." In this way the call from the East for lay-representation, "to save us from ruin" is answered by the above echo from the West—"from ruin!"

We close this article with the insertion of a letter entire, which so fully sustains the position of this journal that further comment is unnecessary:—

Mr. Linton.—I have had the pleasure of receiving three numbers of your excellent paper, and I think I would be wanting in duty if I did not express my pleasure in seeing a paper commencing to advocate those principles, which my conscience and my bible both declare to be consistent with the religion of Christ, and the mutual rights of the members of Christ's mystical body. A fair representation in Conference, by Lay Delegates appears to me essential to the proper organization of a Christian Church. But, sir, I am well aware that those Demas's who work in the silver mine, and those Judas's who carry the bag, and those Diotrophes's, who love the pre-eminence will not willingly submit to have their power, their bag, or their silver come under the scrutiny of intelligent Laymen. But, sir, there is such a striking similarity between the treatment your paper receives, and that which was manifested towards some men of your own principles in 1829, that I cannot but notice it. The character your paper gets here by a certain class of power-saving, money-hunting persons is as follows:—1st. The Editor wants popularity. 2nd.—It is a factious thing. 3rd.—It is an organ for the disaffected.

It is designed to sow dissension, and make division. The advice given in regard to it is, 1st.—Don't take it; 2nd.—Don't read it; 3rd.—Don't keep it in your house; 4th.—Don't listen to it if read by others.

Now, sir, notwithstanding all this paraphernalia, I conceive that truth never need to flinch from investigation, and that it is a sign of a bad cause for its advocates to try to close the eyes of the people against investigation. But, sir, in spite of all the dust that can be thrown in the eyes of the people, by the enemies of a fair scriptural system of Church Government, yet there are many, and thank God that many increasing, who read and hear, and like the noble Bereans, search the scriptures to see if those things were so. I believe, sir, that the Gospel is designed by the great Head of the Church, to produce that change in the minds of men which will break down that haughty spirit and its influence, that led to the first fall of man and angels:—

"Aspiring to be Gods the Angels fell,  
Aspiring to be Angels men rebel."

From that time to this, ambitious men have sought for power, and tried to make the Bible support their claims, but it never will do, we must come down to that humiliating standard which St. Paul set up, when he said, "We preach not ourselves (viz., as your lords or rulers) but Christ Jesus the Lord, and ourselves your servants for Jesus' sake."

### DIVISION.

"Therefore saith the Lord God of Israel, against the Pastors that feed my people, Ye have scattered my flock, and driven them away, and have not visited them."

Notwithstanding all that we have said, in former numbers, in reference to the object we have in view in publishing the "Wesleyan Methodist," we are still charged, by some persons, with intending to effect a division in the Wesleyan Methodist Church.

In our January number, writing on the subject of the public interference of the Methodist Clergy in the politics of the day, we made the following remarks:—

"If, in the next Session of Conference, some declaration on this subject, satisfactory to all the members of the Church, be not made, disappointment and dissatisfaction will ensue, of the most pernicious consequences, and which must result in the organization of another Methodist Church, entirely neutral as to politics,—a result exceedingly disastrous, and which our most strenuous efforts shall be made to prevent."

On that occasion we had in view the inevitable effect of such conduct, upon a people possessing a high reputation for piety. If the members of the Wesleyan Methodist Church deserve this praise, they will not, they cannot approve of political preachers. If they do not deserve this praise, they may. We shall leave to our opponents the responsibility of deciding this question, by saying that the members of the Church will sustain such ministers as Dr. Ryerson, or those who sanction his political conduct: by so doing, they slander the whole community. Sooner or later, it is absolutely certain that the most pious portion of the people will either control the Conference on the subject, or seek some other remedy. This they may do gradually and imperceptibly, or otherwise, as separation in a body, is not the only way in which division may be a final result of their

We are not able to predict particular occurrences; but we insist on the fact, that a spiritually-minded people will not sustain a political ministry. Perhaps the division we predicted might be that of separating nearly the whole body from such preachers, making them, and the few who might adhere, the real separatists—the authors of division.

But no one has a right to say that we meditate a division of the Church, when we emphatically deny it: no one can give us credit for honesty and sincerity if it were possible for us to be contemplating a division, when we said that such an event would be exceedingly disastrous, and that our utmost efforts should be made to prevent it.

In our February number, we had occasion to notice the subject again, as a contemporary had quoted the above paragraph, omitting the concluding sentence. We then repeated, in effect, the declaration on the subject previously made: Notwithstanding, the opponents of our journal continue most industriously to circulate the misrepresentation, that our object is division. Some of them, we regret to say, are members of the Conference, who neither read our paper, nor allow, so far as their influence can prevail, the members of the Church to do so,—more effectually, perhaps, to support their own assertion, and to induce others to believe them; for it would be impossible either for them, or any one else, to say that our object is division, if they read our paper. Once more, under the impression of the necessity of strengthening our position on this point, we pledge our veracity, honesty, and sincerity on the question, and assert that our object is not division. Not only so, but we will most heartily afford every possible assistance towards the great object of gathering into the body those dispersed members of the Methodist family who have been aggrieved, and scattered by the baneful influence of the dominant power in the Conference, which has been exercised for some years past. Some of these have been the most able and most useful members of the Church, both lay and clerical. The unity and integrity of Methodism is dear to us, as it is to thousands of the older members of the Church; and we are aware, that if we were vulnerable on this point, we should lose their support in our present undertaking, and should deserve to lose it.

To satisfy these more fully, and to silence those who thus misrepresent us, we shall be still more explicit as to our object, which will prove that division was never contemplated by us.

Our object is to effect an entire separation of the clergy from all public interference in politics, and to separate the Church from all dependance on Government for support: the latter is the natural consequence of the former. Our paper, the instrument in this undertaking, is under the management of a committee of lay-members of the Church, supported by correspondents in all parts of the Province, also members of the Church.

All these are compactly united in support of the best interests of the Church: they love it, they are devoted to it; and they expect

the instructions and consolations of religion, till they rest from their labours. We put the question therefore seriously to the friends of the Church; how can these parties accomplish their object by leaving the Church? They have history and experience in condemnation of division generally, and they are fully persuaded that division will not accomplish the object they have in view.

Besides, Canada itself furnishes melancholy evidence of the injurious tendency of division. What a number of Methodist bodies have we now in the Province, once so strong, compact, and prosperous! Our present unhappy and divided Church included nearly the whole.

Let us suppose that all these, with the British Wesleyans and those of the New Connexion were united in one body: in such a unity there would be strength; but what are they now? They would, united, be the most powerful for good, and perhaps the most prosperous, and most numerous of the religious bodies in the Province.

Who separated them? It would be well if those who charge us with contemplating division were clear of the charge, of having been too instrumental in causing it. We allude to the governing portion of the Conference of the Wesleyan Methodist Church, and especially to Dr. Ryerson and those who have acted with him, in the business of the Union, in 1833, and its dissolution in 1840.

Having cleared ourselves, we hope, from the charge of intending to effect a division, we shall retort the charge, and we believe with more effect, on the real authors of division. We regret to say, that it is because our object is not division, that such an intention is imputed to us: if it were clearly our object, it would be more satisfactory to some. We are too familiar with the usual reply given to all who complain of the existence of abuses in the Church; they are contemptuously called croakers; and it is said to them, "If you do not like our system, you may leave the Church." This is the method adopted by some of the rulers of the Church to prevent division—by separating members from the Church daily. No wonder that the Church increases in number so slowly. But is this a just reply to those who have grounds for complaint? Is it just to tell a man who has made the Methodist Church his spiritual home on earth, for himself and his family, for twenty, thirty, or forty years, to go elsewhere,—to say to him, "Go, serve other Gods?" Is it reasonable that such persons should have any interest in causing division?—the very men who have built the Churches, and been their supporters for years!

If the object of division could be inferred from our publication, our opposers would readily publish the proofs of it: On the contrary, they attempt to suppress and forbid our paper, lest they should be confuted by it.

The real authors of division are some of the members of the Conference, who wish to be left alone, and to be relieved of all members of independent mind, and who dare to

them in love, and point out errors, for the general good. We have pretty good evidence that they would bring to the ecclesiastical tribunal all who patronize this journal, as well as its managers, if they could find any portion of the discipline that could be brought to apply to the case. Their success in such a process might effect a division, and that of such magnitude that it would be doubtful whether that portion submitting to the present state of the Church, would be numerous enough to deserve the name.

Though, even in such a case, we believe the Conference would hold on to their power, in hope of recruiting in numbers, to supply the place of those that were expelled. "Skin for skin; all that a man hath will he give for his life," is a scriptural sentiment. It applies, in our opinion, to the governing portion of the Wesleyan Methodist Conference, in relation to their love of power, and tenacity of adherence to it. A separation of a few hundreds, or a few thousands, is of less consequence to them than the loss of power.

We conclude, therefore, that those who resist our scriptural reasons for a separation of the clergy from all secular affairs, and who would drive us out of the Church on that account, are the real authors of division.

But we have another proof, as to this point, that the governing portion of the Conference are the real promoters of division. They even now contemplate to separate from their fraternity those ministers who are likely to be their competitors for government in the Conference. These are the most pious of the preachers, but perhaps of less brilliant talents, and who consequently meekly and gladly submit to appointments of spiritual labour in the wilderness, or any where. These, it is contemplated to pay off, or, rather to buy off, by giving them a sum of money to retire; and till they consent to this, Methodism will be made irksome to them, if possible, by excluding them from all the most desirable stations and circuits. To be Chairmen of Districts is no part of their destiny.

This will astonish some of our readers; and lest they should think we are accusers of the brethren, we submit the following extract of a communication from Picton, the author of which we can produce whenever we think it necessary:—

"You will agree with me in saying, this is a most serious and suspicious affair on the part of the ministry of our Church. The facts are these. A leading minister of our Conference, while in a general conversation with a respected clergyman of another denomination, calmly acknowledged that many of our old preachers were not adequate, as far as talent is concerned, to take a prominent place in the itinerant work, and fearing that, ere many years, the Conference would be burdened with the pecuniary claims of such men on the funds of the Connexion, a plan is being set on foot, to be carried out as soon as practicable, to induce such aged and other second-class preachers to accept something like £100 sterling, and withdraw from the Conference altogether. Comment on this is unnecessary. On the other side I furnish you with the names of the parties with whom this conversation occurred, and you are at liberty to use them, should occasion require."

We confess that we were more astonished on receipt of this communication, than at anything that we had previously heard or seen, in reference to the conduct of the ruling members of the Conference. We would ask in the hand of the party in the

who contemplate the union on the part of the British Conference securing, on their part, a double operation,—the one, in relation to the Canadian portion of the ministry, to get rid of objectionable members, who may be competitors for power in the next Conference; the other, in relation to the British Conference, to send missionaries to supply those vacancies, and thus forever secure a majority for the British Conference, making the whole Church a political machine, as well as to subject it more completely to the arbitrary rule of persons upwards of three thousand miles distant! However this may be, we are pretty sure that such a scheme will not conduce to the peace and prosperity of the Church; nor will it succeed in reference to securing the entire political support of the members of the Church to the Government, to whatever party the Conference may direct its exercise. We predict that they who contemplate this will be disappointed: the Canadian Methodists will not be the tools of ecclesiastical power for the benefit of any party. On the contrary, the attempt to use them politically will only arouse their opposition, and result in their more independent exercise of the elective franchise.

The following is taken from the Kingston Herald of December 21, and forms part of a communication from Cobourg to the Editor of that journal. It is a more complete exposure of the unprincipled conduct of the Rev. Egerton Ryerson, and at the same time affords incontestable evidence in support of every assertion made on the subject in former numbers of this journal:—

"We are now arrived at a more wonderful period of Mr. Ryerson's history, namely, the last twelve months, which are more intimately connected with our present design, and more fraught with interest to the inhabitants of Western Canada. So much has been said of late concerning Mr. Ryerson's defence of Sir Charles Metcalfe, and the political BRIBE which he received, and which has been very generally ascribed to him by his fellow countrymen, that I would add nothing to the voluminous accusations and even facts which have already appeared, did I not regard it as my duty for the sake of those who have brought those charges, and have been accused of slander, principally because they were unacquainted with his private correspondence with the government—the most correct source of evidence—to expose his dishonest pretensions and political obliquities. Mr. Ryerson's warm attachment to the principles advocated by the late Ministry are well known, as well from the eulogy which he passed upon them in his remarks upon Sir Charles Bagot's Administration, as from his general conversation, and otherwise avowed sentiments. Upon the resignation of the Ministers, Mr. R. was loud in his exclamations against His Excellency, whom he designated, "a second Sir Francis," through the instrumentality of Lord Stanley and the Tory government at home, in order to prevent the favourable working of responsible government; and, by forcing the Ministry to resignation, so manage as to bring again into power the remnants of the obsolete "Family Compact." A short time after this Mr. Ryerson read to at least three or four officers of the College a letter which he had received from an influential minister of the Methodist Church, containing some of the most bitter denunciations against Sir Charles Metcalfe, and added,—"What a pity you are not now Editor of the Guardian that you might have an opportunity to expose the tyrannical conduct of the Governor General!"—Mr. Ryerson then proceeded to say what course he would pursue were he indeed Editor of the Guardian; and made such statements as created a strong impression on these individuals' minds that he intended to write an Appeal to the country in behalf of the Ex Ministry. In the month of January he published in the Guardian a reply to Mr. Draper's speech on the University Bill.—He received a letter from Mr. Draper thanking him for the courtesy with which he had treated him; and about the same time, one from the Governor General's Secretary requesting his presence at Kingston, as he wished to receive his advice concerning the present state of affairs. Though his vanity was flattered at this, still he indulged in some unpleasant reflections upon his Excellency's probable position in this send-

ing for him; and just before his departure for Kingston, he inquired of one of the officers of the College whether he had any idea to suggest relative to public matters. The individual's reply was, "that he had nothing further to say than that he believed it to be his Excellency's object to get him down to Kingston so as to enter into some compromise to receive his influence in bringing over the Methodist Church to support his government." Dr. R. declared that he thought such was the object of the Governor-General and Mr. Draper; and he would therefore be on his guard. In the Toronto Examiner of October 31, Mr. Ryerson roundly asserts,—"that the result of his investigations between his Excellency and the late Counsellors was announced to two individuals before he had seen his Excellency since the resignation of the Ministry;" and declares that decision to have been in accordance with his late political writings which were "as free as the air he breathes," but with what degree of moral honesty or truth my readers shall judge. The fact, however, soon became apparent to all connected with the institution, that a serious change had taken place in Mr. Ryerson's political views since his visit to Kingston. He was exuberant in his praises of Sir Charles, whose liberality he declared knew no bounds, and whose many amiable personal qualities rendered it impossible for him to be any other than one of the best of men. At length it became generally reported that the Principal of Victoria College had been BRIBED to the Government interest by the promise of the office of Superintendent of Education. In the mean time he received several communications from the government, which, together with his replies, he read publicly to the students and some of the people in town, in the College Chapel. In the first letter the Governor offers to the Rev. Egerton Ryerson the appointment of Assistant Superintendent of Education for Canada West, assigning as his reasons, the confidence which he had already rendered the country, and "the strong support which he would bring to his government." This appointment, then, was not made with a view to advance the educational interests of the people—as it evidently never could do—but in consideration of "THE STRONG SUPPORT WHICH MR. RYERSON WOULD BRING TO THE GOVERNMENT!" Mr. R. objected that he was unwilling to accept the office until Mr. Murray could be provided for.—His Excellency replied that after consulting with Mr. Draper, the only member then in his council, a satisfactory arrangement had been made.—Here the matter ended (so far as we knew) until Spring when Dr. R. again visited Kingston, and after his return, came out in defence of the Governor: whilst in the mean time the appointment was suspended until he finished his writings, when he was gazetted to the office—the reward of his iniquity. What an outrage upon the virtue and intelligence of the country, to place such a man in charge of its educational interests! Notwithstanding all this, the Christian Guardian of the 30th October, strives to cover Mr. Ryerson's obliquities, and make the Methodist community believe that this appointment "is one of the first steps towards the exemplification of the principle of equal rights and privileges towards the body of Methodist Ministers, and the denomination of the Methodist people in this Province,"—an appointment which was purchased at the expense of Methodist honour, of Methodist integrity and piety. Since this Mr. Ryerson has gone to England. "Peace to his ashes!" J. S.

We refer to the above article for proofs and illustrations of our remarks in the following:—

THE CASE OF DR. RYERSON.

"For both prophet and priest ere profane, yea, in my house have I found their wickedness saith the Lord."

Before entering on the subject of Dr. Ryerson's public conduct, we wish to guard against any misconception of our language by stating explicitly, that we only refer to the public character of Mr. Ryerson. As we expect to be charged with personal opposition to him, we also add, that even for his public conduct, as a preacher of the Gospel, we do not consider him individually responsible to the members of the Methodist Church; he being only one member of the Conference, we look not to him but to the whole body: at the same time we cannot pursue our course, at least on this subject, without referring to him in the most prominent manner; as the whole history and proceeding of the Canada Conference, for the last fifteen years or more, forms part of the history of the public conduct of that gentleman.

When the Conference was organized, at the time the Wesleyan Methodist Community became an independent body in the province, Mr. Egerton Ryerson was one of its leading members. When the political agitation arose under W. L. Mackenzie, the same person was, at first, one of his coadjutors, sometime after one of his opposers; and as Editor of the Guardian was engaged generally in political controversy. Whether in London as the author of Letters on Canadian politics, or in Canada, as the author of impres-

sions.—or the advocate of Sir Francis Head and the Family Compact, as the party was called who supported him, we find him incessantly occupied in the most prominent station before the Church and the public. When the union was formed between the Wesleyan Methodist Church and the British Conference, the same person took the most active part, as also he did on its dissolution. He was the person to whom most of the opposition and complaints of the British Conference related, and he was the person sent to England to defend the Canadian Conference there. Since the dissolution of that Union, though located for a time at Cobourg, as President of Victoria College, and professedly retired from politics and public writing generally, he has successively appeared before the public as the advocate of Lord Sydenham, Sir Charles Bagot and Lord Metcalfe. So fully has he taken the position of leader in the Conference of the Wesleyan Methodist Church in connection with his active interference in public affairs, that the members of the Church have been called Ryersonians, and he, the John Toronto of Methodism. By uniting in himself the three separate characters of a Preacher of the Gospel, the principal ruler of the Church, and a most active political partisan and controversialist, he has subjected the members of the Church to frequent mortifications; tending to alienate them from the Church, or from himself.—it being unavoidable in their ordinary contact with their fellow citizens, to be associated with his politics because they preferred his Church; though with regard to thousands, that Church would have been their choice, if the name of Dr. Ryerson had never been heard of. He is still the idol of the Conference, or their master, at all events their leader, their agent now in England—their President of Victoria College, and holding a government office with a salary of £375 sterling, or about \$1,800 per annum.

From this brief glance at Mr. Ryerson's public career, who he has always held the sacred office of a Minister of the Gospel, it is impossible not to conclude that his public conduct must have considerably affected his usefulness as a preacher of the Gospel for good or evil. To some, he has doubtless, through affinity in political opinions, been always welcome; to those of opposite opinions always the contrary; who these have changed places, or he has changed politics. While chapels have been crowded to hear him, the same occasion was a signal to others to keep away from him. We hesitate not to say that, under such circumstances he was the instrument of spiritual profit to neither party. While the former saw no fault in him but considered him as an angel of God, and were led through him even into his political eccentricities; the other party having set a him in the public press accused of falsehood, and retorting it fiercely on his opponents, have looked very differently at his spiritual ministrations, and on his account have even "abhorred the offering of the Lord."

We put it to the serious consideration of the Wesleyan Methodist Church, whether there is the least ground to charge us with personal opposition to Mr. Ryerson, or any other Minister of Religion, because we feel it our duty to point out the evil consequences of their public interference in political affairs; and whether the general conclusion to which we now come is not perfectly correct. That it is impossible that he could be a useful or profitable Minister of the Gospel, or have any other than an influence for evil on the whole community.

It is an unfortunate coincidence that the Church has seen no prosperity, of any consequence, during the prevalence of his influence.

A more expressive coincidence still remains to be mentioned. Mr. Ryerson's influence yet prevails, and his political interference is carried to the greatest extent, so much that he is now in Government pay without performing the duties of his office, enjoying at least a temporary sinecure, while he has liberty to act in London as political agent to the Government, and, as we conjecture, an actual representative of the Canada Conference to effect another Union; and what is the state of the Church now?

In the foregoing observations we have not even approached the subject of moral impropriety on the part of Dr. Ryerson, and yet we have said enough to convince every unprejudiced mind of the necessity of the Conference disavowing Dr. Ryerson's conduct, and entirely renouncing his policy in the government

of the Church. But we now come to a more serious subject, that of the inconsistencies in Dr. Ryerson's public writings, involving violations of truth totally incompatible with the character of a preacher of the Gospel—such as would subject a private member of the Church to expulsion,

In entering upon a part of our subject so delicate and so painful, we once more invoke the candid and serious attention of the old and experienced members of the Church. We ask them this question, "If there be any abuse, ought we, who know it, to speak or to be silent?" If we are willing to take all the reproach, censure, and condemnation, we should justly deserve on being found slanderers: if our character for veracity either cannot be impeached, or if found vulnerable, we are willing to be exposed to public contempt and disgrace, ought not the members of the Church to hear us patiently? Is it an offence to speak of these things? If it is not, it is our duty to speak, and the duty of our brethren to hear. If it is, then the discipline operates to prevent the disclosure of abuses, to prevent reproof for sin, to shut up the sources of advice and improvement, and, being contrary to the word of God, ought to be immediately altered. Again, we ask, are those who point out and prove the existence of abuses against either members or people, disaffected towards the Church, and its enemies? Would they not be enemies if they held their peace? What says the Scripture, "Thou shalt not in any wise suffer sin upon thy brother." We shall, therefore, endeavour to perform a painful duty in pointing out some of the inconsistencies and contradictions in which Dr. Ryerson has involved himself, and if the unavoidable inference be, that he has been utterly regardless of truth, it cannot be laid to our charge.

On the 29th of May, 1844, Dr. Ryerson announced his intention to offer to the public some remarks in defence of Sir Charles Metcalfe. On that occasion he said, that he had not thought proper to accept the office of Superintendent of Education. We suppose he meant the office of Deputy-superintendent, for the Chief-secretary is *ex-officio* the Superintendent.

The article preceding these remarks proves, that at Cobourg, Dr. Ryerson had received the offer of that office, and we have the testimony of the Ministers of the Wesleyan Methodist Church, that he had accepted it. That testimony dates in March and April previous. All that was not consummated in the business was the announcement to the public of his having accepted the office, which, for prudential considerations, was to be deferred till his defence of Sir Charles Metcalfe was concluded. Here, in May, he denied accepting the office, while in March and April previous we can prove he had accepted it—while, to make this falsehood more palpable, he tells the public, in a letter to the editor of the *Examiner*, dated October 22nd, that he never heard of the vacancy of that office until August following. Here mark the jesuitical expression, he did not hear of the vacancy, surely not because Mr. Murray was to occupy till Dr. Ryerson was fully ready to take his place.

The next subject we only notice in reference to Dr. Ryerson's inconsistency, not, in the least, with a view of reference to politics. In pursuing his course as defender of Sir Charles Metcalfe, he informs the Canadian public, that in India there is an equality of civil and religious privileges, from which assertion he infers, with other qualifications, the complete adaptation of Sir Charles Metcalfe to the duties of Governor of Canada. Now, is it true, that in India there is an equality of civil and religious privileges? With respect to civil privileges, there is not the least truth in the assertion. First, there is no representative system of government in existence there; secondly, to this moment all offices of responsibility are filled by a class of people who were, and perhaps are, agents of the East India Company, all Europeans without exception. Would Canadians say that there was perfect equality in the enjoyment of civil privileges, if no persons were to be found filling offices of honour, responsibility, and emolument, but natives of England? Such is the equality in India.

With reference to the religious equality in India we are not sufficiently acquainted with the subject, but we believe that the same attempt at ecclesiastical supremacy is made by the Church of England there, as in other Colonies, and that the actual inferiority to them of other denominations is sufficiently felt.

When conscience clearly indicates a duty, there is no occasion to resort to casuists; but such is human nature, that in general men never resort to casuists, but when that faculty clearly points out their duty—it is because conscience is against them that they go to these arbiters, as Saul went to the Witch of Endor because God had forsaken him.

Dr. Ryerson may have had forbidding qualms of conscience on the subject of Clergymen discussing political questions. He, therefore, goes to a Doctor of Divinity—we do not say a casuist nor a Witch of Endor—but he goes somewhere for directions how to violate a plain command and obligation previously binding on him, "You have nothing to do but to save souls, give thyself wholly to them." This Doctor of Divinity is a *very eminent one*, of the Wesleyan Methodist Connexion in London. Now, there are so few Doctors of Divinity in the Connexion, that there is scarcely a chance of the appearance of a very eminent one, about six is the average number in the Connexion.

We suspect this flattering title of "very eminent" is given for the purpose of showing the pains taken by Dr. Ryerson to go to the highest source for advice, and of making an impression among those who know very little of Methodism in England. We do not wish to see Methodism lowered in public opinion here, but this reference to very eminent Doctors of Divinity among the Methodists in England would certainly do so—it would cause both them and the writer to be laughed at.

To the praise of the person, whoever he might have been, "He deprecated any religious body having any connection with secular party politics," and the same accommodating Doctor thought, "That a Minister who had been endowed by his Maker with talents, and possessed the qualifications to discuss questions of government, was responsible to God for their exercise, as well as for any other means of public usefulness, when the general interests of the country demand their use."

The advice given is quite in accordance with that of the ancient oracles, giving the enquirer a shadow of excuse for the course he might take, without giving him liberty to take any.

On the subject that Ministers of the Gospel have other work, and that there are others to do the political work of the age, and that Dr. Ryerson was not called to it, we might say much more, but we have not space, and wish to keep close to our subject.

We take the liberty to ask, why he did not consult the word of God, and the discipline of his own Church, instead of a *very eminent Doctor of Divinity* in England. Had Dr. Adam Clark been alive to be consulted, he could have given a very different answer to that of the *very eminent Doctor of Divinity*.

Nearly every unbiased person has regarded the boasted liberality of Lord Metcalfe in donations to Churches and public Institutions as a part of his policy in securing parliamentary influence, as well as that of the act of engaging Mr. Ryerson to defend him before the public.

Mr. Ryerson contradicted both; the first, by praising Lord Metcalfe as a "fortune spender in the country from which it is attempted to ostracize him," and by characterizing those imputations as "groundless and malicious," and of "unparalleled meanness." The second, by responding to the charge that he had been hired, by giving the editor of the *Examiner* such a form of denial as is quite consistent with the truth of those charges. He first says, "Had this been the case it would not have falsified my arguments;" and, also, "you adduce not a shadow of proof in support of them in your charges;" and, again, "Up to this time (Oct. 22nd, have never received one farthing;" and, further, "nor was any pecuniary inducement so much as hinted at, nor have I received a penny to defray any expense which I have incurred in various ways, in my defence of his Excellency."

We shall give the contradictions to all these statements from Dr. Ryerson himself.

In his letter before us, to the editor of the *Examiner*, Oct. 22nd, he says, "When his Excellency learned in August, that I desired not merely to go to England with a view of promoting the interests of Victoria College, but to travel on the Continent, and to investigate the Educational system of the most enlightened nations of Europe, and that I did not wish to undertake the duties of the Educational office (which I learned at that time,

for the first, was about to become vacant), he was pleased not only to approve of my views but considered such a tour of enquiry of such importance to the Province, that he not only expressed a willingness to countenance it by the sanction of his name, but with his characteristic princely liberality spontaneously offered to render any other assistance necessary to promote, to the greatest possible extent, investigations and enquiries so obviously calculated to advance the best interests of Canada." We ask if a promise of "princely liberality," made in August, was not equal to cash Oct. 22nd, when he said, "Up to this time I have never received one farthing?" From the date of the promise in August, he could, undoubtedly, draw on the Governor at any time as pleased, no doubt it was polite to refrain until he had finished his defence, when the spontaneous writing could be more conveniently paid by equally spontaneous liberality; when we can prove, that he was actually in the receipt of £375 sterling, or about \$1800 currency, per annum, at that time, having actually accepted the office of Deputy-superintendent of Common Schools, by our testimony in March and April, and by his own in August; and when we see his admission of a promise of "princely liberality" in August, with what truth could he say in October, "nor was any pecuniary inducement so much as hinted at?" We request the Methodist community to take this in connection with the evidence of two members of the Conference, one of whom said, that it was understood that he was not to enter on the duties of his office till after Conference; that he had accepted the office in question in March and April, and to reflect on these facts. Further, on the subject of giving money to the various religious denominations, we have his own declaration, that it could only be considered as bribing them. While he was editor of the *Christian Guardian*, and writing in support of the Mackenzie agitation he says:—

"A Protestant Government here is endowing the Episcopal Clergy with one seventh of the Province, the Catholic Clergy with £1,150, and the Kirk Clergy with £600. And a professedly Christian Government appropriates the revenues of the country, to the support of the Clergy of these contradictory creeds. Now suppose an individual to lend his influence and assistance alike to support these various creeds; which would be the natural and legitimate inference? Would it be that he believed the truth of all these creeds?—This is impossible. Could it be that he believed the truth of any one of them?—This is equally impossible, for his supporting all, is arming one against the other—a kingdom divided against itself—pulling down with one hand, and building up with the other. Would not the inference then be that such an individual has no real faith in either of these religious creeds; but that he pays a bribe to the clerical advocates of each, provided they all advance his political purposes."

Lord Metcalfe has done the very thing here pointed out by Dr. Ryerson, and according to him could have no real faith in either of the three creeds mentioned, though he devoutly attended the English Church. Had his political opponents said so, in the recent dispute, the *Colonist* and *Christian Guardian* would have added each another five columns, dilating to the utmost on the uncharitableness of the imputation. They, however, only agree with Dr. Ryerson, that the just inference would be that such an individual was bribed. As he is one of the parties bribed, though not one of those enumerated by him, but a clerical member of another Church, we only assent to his own doctrines by stating that the object of the Government was to bribe him, for again, he says in the same letter, "could any other inference be drawn, respecting an Administration that should pursue the same policy." He perhaps, little thought when he wrote this a few years ago, that he would be describing the conduct of the Administration in 1844, and his own, in similar circumstances pointed out by himself.

In page 162, section 2, of his pamphlet, Dr. Ryerson says that the partisans of the Toronto Association have endeavoured to make the Wesleyan Methodist Church a party to their proceedings against Her Majesty's Government and the Governor-General. At the time this was written, there was no Government in the Province, but that of the absolute authority of the Governor-General, and it was sufficient to excite the indignation of every British subject against such a usurpation, without the assistance of any Association. But has not Dr. Ryerson throughout the defence, especially in the appendix, endeavoured to make the Wesleyan Methodist Church a party to his proceedings against the liberties of the people? Is

there no question of importance but that of submission to Her Majesty's Government and the Governor-General? If the people are associated even in the Government, there is such a thing as opposition to them, as well as to Her Majesty's Government. However, the Toronto Station address merely gave him some appearance of liberty to oppose it, and an excuse for claiming from the Methodists their support to the Government.

To accomplish this object, he first says that the Wesleyan Methodist Church was entitled to a representation in the Legislative Council, of at least two or three members; but though an addition of several members have been made to that body, no member of the Wesleyan Methodist Church was deemed worthy of a recommendation. How does Mr. Ryerson become acquainted with all the cabinet secrets so much as to know who was recommended for office? This is an insinuation against the late Ministry unworthy of any public writer, much less of a Minister of the Gospel. It is without a shadow of reason, and were it true that the number of members of the Methodist Church, in the Legislative Council, were few in proportion to those of other denominations, it is a most mischievous doctrine to start, that these councils should be composed with reference to the religious creed of the members. It is calculated to set all sects striving for pre-eminence, and to disseminate and perpetuate the same contention throughout the Province.

If the Methodist body coincided in this attempt to thrust a full proportion of their members into office, they would offend other sects and raise an opposition against themselves, to which with regard to others they would as readily have recourse. We could scarcely conceive a more flagrant departure from that principle of that Divine Truth, thus expressed:—"My kingdom is not of this world," than appears on the part of Dr. Ryerson, in bringing such a charge against a Government.

And we ask, how does this anxiety to procure the admission of members of the Wesleyan Methodist Church into the Legislative Council, correspond with his labour at that time going on, to prevent any of that Church being Reformers, from entering into the other house of Parliament? His zeal for the Church is spurious; he would have them all in or all out of either, just as they supported a Tory policy, or not.

His second attempt to alienate the members of the Methodist Church is of the same character, by stating that in the Victoria District there is an extraordinary exclusion of members of that Church, appointed to the Magistracy. This charge has been refuted by a letter from Mr. Flint, one of the Magistrates referred to, and also by the editor of the Victoria Chronicle who proves that there were more persons than appointed who were either members of the Wesleyan Methodist Church, or attendants on their ministry, than of any other denomination. There is not only here a false assertion clearly made out, but it was contradicted as soon as Dr. Ryerson published it, about July or early in August. That refutation he has seen, and could not disprove; nevertheless, after knowing this, some thousands of copies of the appendix were issued, so late as October 12, in the form of a whole edition, or supplement to the British Colonist of that date.

We have now pointed out these serious contradictions in all of which the charge of misrepresentation is fully proved; we leave it to the members of the Church to decide whether this conduct is consistent with the obligations of a Minister of the Gospel.

We make no personal complaint, we have nothing to do with Dr. Ryerson, but with the Conference; that body has sustained Dr. Ryerson and identified itself with his whole political conduct. He is now on a mission on their business. He is a member of their body; and their organ, the Christian Guardian, has uniformly defended and eulogized him to the present moment.

But what is more surprising, the same leaders of the Conference, in verbal conversation, condemn and repudiate him. To an influential person in the Province, only a few days since, one of them emphatically deprecated the course of Dr. Ryerson and condemned his interference in politics. He was appropriately answered, that may be all very well to say now, but when it is seen that he is supported by the leading men in the Conference still, without the least public disapproval in their organ, people will be very

slow to receive such verbal explanations. Indeed this journal is treated much in the same way privately, it is stated even by members of the Conference that the whole paper is a tissue of falsehoods and slanders, such as could be refuted in a moment: at the same time their organ is silent. What is the unavoidable inference, but that they cannot prove publicly what they say privately?

It is easy now to repudiate Mr. Ryerson, but do they not sustain, employ, and pay him? It is easy to assert that our journal is a tissue of falsehoods but we defy them to prove it to the members of the Church through their organ the Christian Guardian.

We have by no means exhausted the subject, but the present article is already too long, and we must conclude it, by insisting that the evils we have pointed out call imperatively for the interference of the lay members to suppress them, and lay-delegation alone affords the prospect of doing it.

### THE CONTEMPLATED UNION—ITS EFFECTS, IN RELATION TO THE FINANCIAL AFFAIRS OF THE CHURCH.

In our last number, we brought before our readers the subject of a union contemplated between the British Methodist body, and the Wesleyan Methodist Church. We confined our attention, on that occasion, to the general features of the plan, and could not point out all its consequences, if carried into effect. We shall now do so, in relation to the financial affairs of the Church, by which it will be further demonstrated how serious an evil such an event would be.

The union carried into effect would amalgamate all the financial affairs of the Church with the financial affairs of the British Wesleyan Missionary Society. Every fraction of the funds of the Church would concentrate in the treasurer's account of that Society. The local stewards of circuits would pay him all their balances in hand, after paying the expenses of their circuits, and receive from him the amount of any deficiency there might be. It is impossible, on this system, that the members of the Church could have any control over their preachers, as it removes the only influence the people can exercise (and that only to a small extent), that of giving or withholding their contributions, as they approve of the ministry among them or not. It is a feeble influence at best, as it is scarcely ever exercised. To stop the supplies comes so near to produce a convulsion in the whole Church that very few who love the Church will resort to it—they will bear to the utmost first. It is an influence, however, which operates passively. It is enough that the ministry know that they are dependent on the people for support. This influence the contemplated union entirely removes: the preachers will be henceforth entirely independent of the people; and an arbitrary ecclesiastical government will be established, the most unqualified and the most purely despotic in the history of the world.

On a former occasion, when writing against the Church receiving Government aid, we said that it was an evil, inasmuch, as when the Church is to be sustained by two unconnected parties, neither of them will be disposed to support it efficiently. The Government (one party) would give a moiety either grudgingly or only for value received, and send the ministry back to the people; and

the people (the other party) would send them to the Government. From the latter party, the chief motive to liberality is removed, by receiving any Government aid, and the former will, of course, only make the best bargain it can. We should prefer an entirely state-supported Church to this, and we believe the members of the Wesleyan Methodist Church generally would agree with us.

The argument is exactly the same with regard to a Church partly supported by the people in Canada and partly by the Wesleyan Missionary Society. As in the former case, the preachers would be independent of the people, and their motive to liberality checked by the knowledge of the fact, that whether they give anything or not, the ministry will be supported; so, in reference to the other party—the Missionary Society, it must have a motive for this liberality, in undertaking to pay the deficiency of the preachers salaries of the Wesleyan Methodist Church, to whatever extent the amount may be. This extraordinary liberality is quite unaccountable, especially when it is considered that other parts of the unchristianized world have much stronger claims on the liberality of the Missionary Society than the christianized inhabitants of Canada; unless they believe the latter to be in greater need of missionary labours.

May we not inquire what the object of this liberality is. It is surely not obvious in the existence of any value that the members of the Wesleyan Methodist Church can render for it! except it be their political influence. We believe this points out the real motive for such liberality on the part of the British Wesleyan Missionary Committee.

We have stated that the whole of the funds of the Wesleyan Methodist Church, under this contemplated arrangement, will form part of the Missionary contributions to the British Missionary Society; so also the whole Church in Canada will form part of their Missionary charge. This leads to two evils: one, hinted at in our last number, that the whole Church would be under the government, not of the British Conference, not of their own Conference, on independent principles, as the British Methodists are governed by their Conference, but by the British Missionary Committee, through one of their agents, as President of the Colonial Conference. This would be no union, or, rather, a mockery of a union: it would be a degrading subjection, without prospect of relief, as the whole control of the people, and all their financial affairs, would be in the hands of the clergy. Another evil is, that the Wesleyan Methodist Church would then become a state-supported Church; for, as the contributions from the people will go into the general Missionary treasury, so also will the contributions from the Government, in form of allowances for the support of Missionaries, as now granted. These would still be paid in the same form; and while literally it cannot be said that the Wesleyan Methodist Church is supported by Government, in reality it will be so, through the Missionary Society.

This concerns the whole people of Canada; as those who object to a Church Estab-

lishment of the Church of England denomination, will have the same objection, at least, to one of the Methodist denomination.

But if this union takes place, the Wesleyan Methodist Church becomes an Established Church. Already it is boasted, by some of the members of the Wesleyan Methodist Church, that it stands on a footing superior to that of the other Methodist Churches in the Province, in being legally recognised as the Wesleyan Methodist Church in Canada—the only legitimate branch of the Methodist family in Canada; and this is a recent boast. We regret this vain assumption, and condemn the insinuation of the inferiority of other Christian bodies. This is no part of the Gospel of Christ.

A confirmation of this assumption may be seen in the fact, that in the proposed University Bill, now before Parliament, provision is only made for three Churches: that to which Victoria College belongs is one, while the other two are already admitted Established Churches of the Empire.

This union is likely to meet with the support of preachers; which consideration is a point of the utmost importance to the members of the Wesleyan Methodist Church. It is, doubtless, more pleasant for the preachers to draw their salaries regularly, without delay: it is equally pleasant to be independent of the people to whom they preach. Human nature, in its most perfect specimens, is not proof against these two temptations—money and power. The preachers will be called on to make their choice—these two, with union with the British Conference; or, reliance on their people, and independence of every human authority but that of the Church of which they form a part, in whose authority they participate.

Let those preachers who will advocate a union—which, in reality, dissolves the Wesleyan Methodist Church, and converts it into a Branch of the British Wesleyan Missionary Establishment—forever hold their peace, as to the unchangeable nature of Methodism; and let them give up the argument used against lay-representation drawn from that source.

We consider that lay-representation would be a trifling alteration in the discipline and government of the Church, in comparison of this union.

### THE MISSIONARY SYSTEM.

\* He who sows sparingly, shall also reap sparingly, and he which sows bountifully, shall also reap bountifully.

In our last number, we considered it our duty to criticize the last year's report of the Missionary Society of the Wesleyan Methodist Church, and to point out some instance of misappropriation of its funds. Lest we should give the least occasion to any one to say, "an enemy hath done this," we take the opportunity of suggesting an improvement of the whole Missionary system, which, if attended to, we have no doubt the amount of the Missionary contributions would be at least double its present amount. This result it is our most sincere desire to realise. The relative proportions of the number of members of the Wesleyan Methodist Church and the Methodist Society in Great Britain is about as 20,000 to 200,000, or as one to ten.

The amount of the Missionary contributions in England is about £200,000, while that in Canada, of the Wesleyan Methodist Church, is only £2,100, of which sum nearly one-sixth is absorbed in expenses connected with collecting and disbursing, leaving about £1,700 a-year for Missionary appropriations. This is far below the English standard, which comes to about 10s. each member, while the Canadian Church only averages about 2s. per member per annum. A tenth part of the British fund is about £8,000. The Canadian Church does not contribute £2,000. Admitting that in England the whole sum is not made up of small contributions from members of the Church exclusively—that some special cases of liberality amount to £50, £100, and even to £1,000 from single individuals, yet we see no reason why Canada should not exhibit corresponding liberality, believing that the fault is more in the system than attributable to a deficiency of liberality.

In the Wesleyan Methodist Church, it is true there is what is called a Missionary Society; but, as we intimated in our last number, it is only nominally a Society; if it is one at all, it is a soul without a body, being deficient in substantial organization.

We consider the English system much better, there, the substantial organization is complete, and the Society acts with effective energy throughout the community. In every circuit there is a distinctly organized Missionary Society, under the name of a Branch Society. These Branch Societies have their complete set of officers and a committee; the committee and collectors meet once a month, at the close of the missionary prayer-meeting, and report their progress, and the collectors then render to the secretary the money collected from periodical subscriptions in their respective localities. Each of these Branch Societies have their anniversary celebrations, on which occasion special sermons are preached, and collections made. The produce of these collections, and the periodical contributions, make up the amount contributed in each place. The former are received chiefly from wealthy persons—members or occasional attendants, in the congregation at each place; the latter, chiefly from the members of the Society, who all, with scarcely an exception, contribute something.

In addition to this continued mode of keeping up the interest in the Missionary work, the General Anniversary, held in London, closes the year, by exciting that interest to the highest pitch.

Any one who will look at the two systems will see at once that our Canadian method is nothing more than an annual collection in each congregation; for which some special interest is attempted to be excited, by the visit of a Missionary deputation, to hold meetings at each place. There are no small streams running all the year long into the Missionary treasury, as in England: there are but few monthly Missionary prayer-meetings, where the most recent and interesting Missionary intelligence is read, and by means of which the Missionary spirit is sustained. Here, there are no real organizations, giving actual and honourable employment,

as members of committees, collectors, and other officers, all the year throughout, to the zealous and active young members of the Church, who feel honoured by such offices and employment. These offices in Canada are merely nominal—that of collector is only real for two or three days in the year.

Our object would be, to keep up the Missionary spirit throughout the year, by organising Branch Societies in every Circuit or District; by holding anniversary meetings in each at suitable intervals; by missionary prayer-meetings, and reading, on such occasions, the missionary letters from all parts of the continent of America, as well as general missionary intelligence; and by collecting periodical contributions, of any amount, however small. Such a system would undoubtedly raise a zeal for Missionary work, and enable Canadian liberality to rise to the level of that of Britain. We do not hesitate to predict, that if this plan were adopted, an amount averaging 10s. per annum for each member of the Church would be raised, which would be £7,000 or £8,000.

We should like to see an example set by the principal members of the Church in the chief places of the Province, and we believe the result would place the Wesleyan Methodist Missionary work entirely independent of Government aid, and enable its managers to renounce the present contention for the amount now in abeyance in the hands of Government, to be given, in our opinion, to the parties who can bring the most political support to Government. Let our people rise, and declare their liberality equal to the accomplishment of this object, and the ruling portion of the Conference will have no reason to wait on Government. The affectionate liberality of a pious and praying people would, in our judgment, be a much better foundation for our Missionary work, than to apply to the Government for help, which is little better than the prayer of "O Baal, hear us!" To resort to a praying and zealous people enables us with confidence to say, "Let thy work appear unto thy servants, and thy glory unto their children. And let the beauty of the Lord our God be upon us; and establish thou the work of our hands upon us; yea, the work of our hands, establish thou it."

Hamilton, March 20th, 1845.

Sir,—The within was enclosed in my *Christian Guardian*, of the 19th instant; perhaps you are not aware of the existence of such a production. It would be much fairer if that *Guardian* would take up the subject in its own columns, and come out fearlessly in its own name, and not as an "anonymous applicant" under the cover of another paper,

Your obedient servant,

"A WESLEYAN."

### OURSELVES—A CASE OF SLANDER.

"But I hate him, for he doth not prophesy good concerning me, but evil."—*Ach.*

We have published the Periodical Journal or Wesleyan Methodist now for four months. It has brought very serious charges against the governing portion of the Conference, in relation to their public duties, of which no notice whatever has been taken by their organ, the *Christian Guardian*. The usual impression is now pretty well complete, agreeable to the well-known proverb, "silence gives consent," and that to all our statements. With a short-sighted view of preventing such an impression, the parties referred to have taken proceedings which will only fix that impression deeper in the public mind. That proceeding is not to deny the charges,—not to attempt to disprove them, but to attack private character in a clandestine manner. And not even to commit the

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

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

THE UNIVERSITY BILL.

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

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

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

THE UNIVERSITY BILL AND THE CHRISTIAN GUARDIAN.

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

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

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

(Signed) JOHN STRACHAN

LIEUTENANT-COLONEL ROWAN, Civil Secretary, &c.

Toronto, 17th March, 1835."

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**CHAPEL PROPERTY.**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**DOINGS AT THE GUARDIAN OFFICE.**

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

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

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

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

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

From the *Globe*.

**THE WESLEYAN METHODISTS.**

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

To the Editor of the *Globe*.  
Toronto, 20th March, 1845.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

From the *Globe*.

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

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

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

To the Editor of the *Globe*.

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

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

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

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

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

I am, &c.

JUSTICE.

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