

Technical and Bibliographic Notes / Notes techniques et bibliographiques

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

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

Coloured covers/
Couverture de couleur

Covers damaged/
Couverture endommagée

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

Cover title missing/
Le titre de couverture manque

Coloured maps/
Cartes géographiques en couleur

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

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

Bound with other material/
Relié avec d'autres documents

Tight binding may cause shadows or distortion along interior margin/
La reliure serrée peut causer de l'ombre ou de la distorsion le long de la marge intérieure

Blank leaves added during restoration may appear within the text. Whenever possible, these have been omitted from filming/
Il se peut que certaines pages blanches ajoutées lors d'une restauration apparaissent dans le texte, mais, lorsque cela était possible, ces pages n'ont pas été filmées.

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

Coloured pages/
Pages de couleur

Pages damaged/
Pages endommagées

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

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

Pages detached/
Pages détachées

Showthrough/
Transparence

Quality of print varies/
Qualité inégale de l'impression

Continuous pagination/
Pagination continue

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

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

Title page of issue/
Page de titre de la livraison

Caption of issue/
Titre de départ de la livraison

Masthead/
Générique (périodiques) de la livraison

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>		

TORONTO PERIODICAL JOURNAL.

OR, WESLEYAN METHODIST.

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

VOL. I.

TORONTO, MARCH, 1845.

No. 3.

For the *Globe*

LETTER FROM A MEMBER OF THE METHODIST CHURCH, ADDRESSED TO THE WESLEYAN METHODISTS OF CANADA.

I am much pleased to see by *The Globe* of July 16th 1844, that our Church at Toronto have expressed their dissent from the course taken by Mr. Ryerson. This is as it ought to be. I sincerely hope that it will be responded to from all parts of the Province. My mind has been in prey to the most restless anxiety ever since the announcement of his unholy purpose; not but Mr. Ryerson has a right, like all other men, to his own views of the policy of Government, but I have yet to be convinced of the propriety of a Minister of the Gospel leaving his holy calling, at the bidding of any man, to combat in the angry field of politics, and more especially so, when the subject has assumed such a furious spirit as at present.

What is to become of our Church God only knows. I am lost, not in wonder, love, and praise, but in astonishment, to see our present degraded condition. We are made the sport of every wind. But a short time ago, we were openly insulted by Sir John Colborne, because some of our members interferred in the then politics of the day, now it appears to be a day of trouble with the Government, and our interest is wanted! And how are our favors solicited? By the most dishonourable and mischievous means possible, *i. e.* *Bribe the Ministers, and the flock must follow.*

This is the only legitimate construction that can be put on the attempt; and is, in my humble opinion, the greatest indignity ever offered to the Society in Canada. Had the attempt to deceive us been made in a fair open manner—had a proper person been employed, and *reason*, instead of threats and deception, used as the means, the affront had not been so wicked and glaring; but no! the *known love* which we bear to our spiritual teachers, is made the handle of this business; and we are to be led blind-folded on to the tread-wheel to work our destruction.

What will the world think of us—what can we think of ourselves? unless we resist this and all other attempts, whether openly or covertly, made, to make a tennis ball of our Society.

I rue the day and repent in dust and ashes, that ever our Church received a single cent from the Government, either for building churches or supporting ministers. Better, and more glorious in the sight of Him, "who sees not as man sees," had our songs of praise ascended *free* from our humble dwellings, then fettered with the trammels of State, in stately buildings *then* were our holy aspirations, "praise to God in the highest." Now, our Ministers for "the wages of unrighteousness," leave the altar of the living God to minister in the temple of Baal, and join the heathen cry, "Great is Diana, of the Ephesians and Sir Chas. Metcalfe!!"

Alas how fallen! I call upon you who "have not yet defiled your garments," who have battled the winter storms, and encountered, without murmuring, the scorching heat of summer, to find the isolated settlement—the little school house, there to meet a few hearts, true as your own, and faithful to their Divine Master. I call upon you to remember the little class, when every eye glistened with the water which flowed from the throno of God in their hearts, and every tongue silent, save the broken aspirations of "Alba Father, my Lord and my God!" I call upon you to contrast these soul-stirring scenes, with our present lamentable situation, when *he*, whose duty it was to set an example of goodness and true holiness, has left his little flock and entered the political arena as chief gladiator to fight for the amusement of the great.

Should the efforts of this contaminating example extend to our young preachers, and through them to the more ignorant and unthinking of the flock—for this is the tendency of it, where are we? We become the scorn and laughing stock of the world! Behold, say the contemptuous, your leader is sold, and the society must follow.

Already see the diminished stature of the Rev. Gentleman, returning from the field of strife, bruised, confused, and rendered ridiculous. Where now that dignified air—that calm commanding look—that venerable piety—lost, all lost in the battle of an unglorious strife; and the only consolation of the renegade is, that he has been assisting a party who would annihilate him and his church, if their power was equal to their inclinations.

PROSPECTS OF ANOTHER UNION.

"Except the Lord build the house they labour in vain that build it." We have it from good authority, that another union, between the Wesleyan Methodist Church and the British Conference, is both contemplated and desired; and what will, perhaps, astonish our readers, desired by some of the very individuals who, on the occasion of the dissolution of the union that formerly subsisted, gloried in their independence of the British Conference. Thus it is that they completely justify the conduct of those Ministers who withdrew from the Canada Conference on that occasion.

We do not draw attention to this subject for the purpose of noticing this comparatively trifling inconsistency, but with a view of pointing out the still greater danger impending in the event of another union—of the Wesleyan Methodist Church becoming more completely and permanently an instrument for the exercise of political influence on the people, in favour of the Government, whatever character that Government may be, or the principle of value received in State support.

We shall proceed to show our opinion of the way in which this object is to be effected by the union said to be contemplated.

It has been told us, in accompaniment with the communication of the fact of the approaching union, that we are to have a union on independent and liberal principles. The projected union is to form part of a summation proceeding in relation to the Methodists of Lower Canada, Nova Scotia, and New Brunswick, and we might add, by way of conjecture, to be followed by a similar proceeding in relation to the Colonial Methodists, in every part of the world, as soon as each separate body has assumed the necessary stability and importance. This, or three, unions are to admit of independent Conferences, in each place, united to the main body in England, by the simple connection of their sending a President to each. Of this plan we have much to say, with reference to an unqualified condemnation of it. We assert that they would not be independent Conferences: separate they might be: they would be under the control, not of the British Conference, but of the Missionary Committee of the British Conference. This union would ravel the claims of slavery, in relation to civil and religious privileges, of all the members of the Methodist Churches in the world, except of those who live under foreign government, and would, doubtless, affect other denominations of Christians, in relation to both their civil and religious privileges.

The effect of this union would be, to place agents of the British Missionary Committee at the head of each Conference. These agents would all be supplied from those preachers who had been generally under the orders of that Committee, men pledged, or rather bound in the strongest manner, to implicit obedience to that Committee—men who are bound, body and soul, to that Committee, for life, except they escape the bondage, and provide better for themselves, as we believe some of them have done in stations most distant from England—men for whom there is no salvation in this world, if they disobey the Missionary Committee, whatever they may allow them to hope for in the next.

As some of our readers may require a little more information on this subject, we take the opportunity to say that there are two classes of preachers in England, distinct in many important requisites of ministerial character, while both may be correctly styled Methodist Ministers. The one class composes the great body of Ministers who labour in England, and who are subject to the Conference only.—The others are the Missionaries, and those who have been Missionaries; the last of whom ultimately merge in the former class. These are, and have been subject to the Missionary Committee, from their first engagement of implicit obedience, and from habits acquired on foreign stations, where they are on a footing with the Clergy of the Church of England, and by intercourse with the higher class of Europeans resident abroad, they become a totally different class of people from the Methodist Preachers in England. The former mix with the middle and lower classes in England,

under the influence of the people in some respects than of the Conference, and are independent of the Missionary Committee who are merely their equals.

There would be little objection to such men preaching in Colonial Conferences.

The latter, mix with another class of people as before stated,—are agents of the Missionary Committee, entirely subservient, and who in many respects, interfere in political affairs in the countries where they are sent for spiritual labour as Missionaries. The latter would be sent to preside in Colonial Conferences. These are the class of persons that have been sent to exhibit in their example and preaching and general government of the Churches, a fac-simile of English Methodism. They have not done this, and are not able.—It is impossible; many of them never resided in England twelve months after they became preachers, and consequently, had no practical experience of Methodism in England. Hence the difference of opinion on many subjects between Members of the Wesleyan Methodist Church in this Province, who have been Members of the Society for some time in England, and those who have not. The former well know that Methodism as conducted under the one class of preachers in England, is a very different thing from the same system, so called, conducted by the Missionaries of the same body. We point out this distinction for the purpose of showing the fallacy of the argument which we have no doubt will be used on the occasion, in favour of the contemplated union. It will be plausibly stated that there will be greater security for the efficiency, uniformity, unity, and permanency of Methodism throughout the world, if all the Methodists subject to the government of Great Britain are united under one head, or are comprised in one only Methodist Ministers, it will be plausibly said, preside over independent Conferences in every Colony in the Empire.

We cannot imagine that such an union is contemplated with reference to any advantage to Canada. Neither the interests of Canada or any of the Colonies will ever be consulted on the occasion. The object of such union has reference to England only. There, the Methodist body has attained to great influence, and even to political importance. The questions of slavery and national education prove this.

Their influence in England can decide the question whether the national establishment, as to stand or fall, the British Government will, doubtless give a fair price to obtain this influence in support of the Established Church. The Government will consequently aid the Methodist body in England in consolidating their strength by Colonial unions, by which the influence of the Methodist body in England is increased, and that of the government in the Colonies at the same time. It is well known that Governors of Colonies are subject to the Colonial Office, and if the Colonial Office is subject to the Missionary Committee of the Methodists in England, the subservieny of the Methodists to the government in all the Colonies through their respective Presidents, sent by the Missionary Committee is complete.

We call on the Methodists of Canada to enquire into this subject, and to insist on having a voice in the question as to what Church they shall belong to. We shall wonder if an attempt should be made to effect another union without consulting them. If the principle of lay representation were in operation, there would be neither difficulty or danger in meeting the question of a proposal for Union of the kind we have described, as we are persuaded the lay members of the Church in Canada, are in general, better acquainted with their own interests than parties in England.

We are astonished even in contemplating the amazing power this system of Colonial union would give to the Methodist body in England and to the several Colonial Conferences. Not a preacher would be sent out who had not first given his adhesion to their doctrine of implicit obedience—they would without exception be all of the ultra Tory School in mind and in politics. They would be dispersed through the Colonies, and be so many effective agents of the home establishment, to work into full effect the designs of their masters whether Imperial or Colonial. We know of no precedent to such a system but that of Ignatius Loyola. We trust that the Methodists of Canada, would not countenance the introduction of such a system, but they surely will, if they consent to another union with the British Conference. We trust that our contemporaries of the Press, the religious organs of their respective denominations, will oppose the advent in Canada of such a monstrous, civil and religiously rancid, which must affect every one in the Colony.

We can of course have no notion what the nature of Dr. Ryerson's impressions may be, after his return from

lating minds as his, there is no ground to expect that it will ever again betray affinity to the liberal side, either in religion or politics. Such characters invariably settle on the side of arbitrary power, and enjoy the reward that power is able to provide for them.

With impressions therefore in favour of such an union, we confidently predict he will return to Canada, and begin to undo all that to which he took part in 1833 and 1849. The question to the Methodist community is, whether they will be transferred like chattels to any Church, and system which the new impressions of Dr. Ryerson, may lead to a Conference to attempt. We presume they will not; but they must wake up their attention, and exert all their energy to prevent it.

[The following letter was published in the Examiner, in reply to a letter from the President of the Conference to the writer, published in the same paper. Our object in publishing this letter, is, that the Members of the Wesleyan Church, who do not see the Examiner, may have the opportunity of seeing both sides. The President's letter was published in the Guardian, but in answer to it has been withheld. Those who have read our, may now read the other. We repeat what we stated in our January number, with regard to the letter then promised, of which this is one, that we are not responsible for any assertions to which we are not ourselves the authors. We submit them to the investigation of those who prefer truth, and will take pains to search to it.]

THE PRESIDENT OF THE CONFERENCE, AND A WESLEYAN METHODIST

To the Rev. Richard Jones, President of the Conference of the Wesleyan Church in Canada.

RESPECTED BROTHER,—Your communication, addressed to the editor of the Christian Guardian, and published in that journal on the 10th ultimo, is, of course, regarded as a reply to my letter of the 10th September; and, although you highly censure me for addressing you as the head of the Conference, through a public journal, under a disguised signature, I trust you will receive the explanation which I now most willingly and sincerely offer for the offence, if it be one, against the discipline of our Church. There are offences among civil society, which frequently cannot be reached by civil law, and there are ecclesiastical offences which cannot be rectified under our existing ecclesiastical polity, both of which become, therefore, proper subjects of discussion through the public press. The purity, independence, and prosperity of societies, whether civil or religious, demand the open and free discussion of principles, the candid and fearless exposure of errors, without respect to party, or individual interest, or prejudice;—and that man is neither a friend of truth, nor of the Church to which he belongs, who will "suffer sin upon his brother" to remain unrebuked, or an evil to exist in community without lifting up his voice against it. Truth is not the less deserving of our regard, because it comes from an unknown source; and there are peculiar circumstances which render anonymous discussions as necessary with us as did the peculiar character and circumstances of religious teachers among the Jews render necessary the allegorical mode of address adopted towards them by our Saviour. But, although I write anonymously, I write sincerely; and I beg, therefore, that you will allow me to remove the surmise which your letter intimates of my not being a member in connexion with our communion. However unworthy I may be regarded, believe me when I avow myself a member, in regular standing with the Church, over whose Conference you preside, and that for a long period, I have been known as one, who, not only stood upon important occasions, to extend the interests of our communion by personal influence, but at times, when pecuniary aid was required, felt it as well a privilege as a duty, to have this an opportunity of extending our work. Indeed, sir, by going years would have shown to you, the writer defending Mr. Ryerson before he was aware of his real character; when he was designated by others, even by official members in our society, as hostile to the British Government; and, when, by his political agitation, he seemed to be hostile to the civil institutions of the country. If local facts of this kind, have not long ago come under your notice, they are well and generally known by many of my brethren in the Church.

Your letter is regarded, at this particular juncture, as highly important, giving, as it does, no hint or uncertain indication of the real position occupied by the ministers and people of the Methodist Church in Canada, which, together with some facts to which I propose to direct your attention, as well as that of my brethren, shows to my mind, and will to the thousands in our Israel, the necessity of some salutary change in our ecclesiastical organization—a change required to stay the evils which have so often afflicted our Church in past times, and with which it has again of late been afflicted.

I refer to the political stratagems of some of our leading preachers, and the influencing circumstances under which the members of the body have frequently been placed by them, no less to the detriment of the cause of religion generally, than of the internal peace and happiness of our Church. Through the Conference Press, you make known your displeasure for my attempting in an humble and plain way, to bring before you some late political productions of Mr. Ryerson, slanderous if not libellous on the parties interested; and for daring even to mention the names of three of our respected ministers as exercising a very dubious influence politically. I am threatened with expulsion by discipline. You intimate in your letter what we ought to have preferred a charge against Mr. Ryerson; but I can well imagine, Sir, the difficulty of bringing the Doctor to trial, before any select number of our Ministers alone, and should fear, and my

that such a trial would be a mockery, and would end, I apprehend, as in the case of a venerable member of Conference whom he publicly slandered.

In that case, you may recollect, that although Mr. Ryerson was fully convicted, yet he was acquitted upon making some trifling acknowledgments. I refer of course to the matter of my Rev. James Richardson. This affair is long since past, and the individual injured, has, I doubt not in Christian charity long since forgiven him, but the circumstances are well known to us all. I would respectfully ask you Sir, how could I expect a just consideration of charges which might be preferred against Mr. Ryerson, when he was permitted without censure, unblushingly to hold out a threat to your Book Committee, at a meeting where I believe, you yourself were present, "that unless they supported (politically) by Conference, he would not advocate the claims of our Church in England;" and, on the same occasion when alluding to his political defence of the Governor-General, to remark that "were the preachers to do their part, his writings would have the desired effect upon the Methodist people;" and when in connection with that political arrangement, we have seen the design practically carried out, by our preachers in many places, having employed all their influence to subvert the interests of a political party—that party too which has always stood opposed to the religious and civil liberties of this country? To look for justice from such a source, and under such circumstances would be folly in the extreme.

Moreover Sir, is it not a fact that while at one time, we have your pastoral address read to our Church enjoining upon the membership the importance of altogether abstaining from political excitement, we find at the same time, and during the very sitting of Conference, the party in political allusions of Mr. Ryerson scattered over the whole Province, bringing the cause of Methodism if not religion itself into contempt? But besides this, I feel with shame and sorrow to be fact, that statements of leading Ministers of your Book Committee are fresh in our memory, roundly asserting "that we, (the Methodists) are able to turn the Elections at any time between the contending parties;" and making the degrading confession, "that before the Elections come on, we will throw out our votes, and the party that will give us most, or will take us up, shall have our support!" I may refer also to the appearance of certain articles in the Christian Guardian of a very equivocal character; to the fulsome eulogiums pronounced from the Press by Mr. Ryerson on the eve of his late departure for Europe, upon "the princely liberality" of Sir Charles Metcalfe; to his appointment to a lucrative and important office under Government as a reward for political service; and finally to the insult offered by him to the common judgment of the Methodist people, in a letter lately published in the organ of the Conference, wherein he attempts to prove, that he never wished the Methodist body to be identified with politics; while at the same time he, and many others of our Ministers, were both openly and covertly endeavouring to make our Church a mere political engine!

Were this the only evidence we possess of the design of some of our leading Ministers to make the Methodist people a mere instrument to subserve their own political purposes, and to aggrandize themselves—the only evidence of their departure from moral rectitude on political occasions, it is sufficient to excite the alarm, and rouse the indignation of every pious mind amongst us. But this is not all, and in making the following enquiry of you as President of Conference, I may say that in the language of one who was distinguished for godly sincerity, "I speak forth the words of truth and soberness, for the King knoweth of these things before whom also I speak freely, for this thing was (not) done in a corner." Will Mr. Ryerson or you Sir, as one of the Board of Victoria College deny, that he (Mr. Ryerson) wrote your official predecessor, that it was his intention to come out in defence of the late (Baldwin) Executive Council; or the fact that while letters were in transitu concerning this contemplated arrangement, "THE FEELER," before alluded to was put out, and coming in contact with "the princely liberality" of the Governor-General, secured the base services of Mr. Ryerson and others of our Ministers on his behalf? These Sir, are plain questions, and the Methodist people of Canada whose confidence in their leaders has too often been betrayed, demand a candid and unequivocal reply to them. My former communication concerning some of the moral obliquities of Mr. Ryerson, has been declared by the Secretary of Conference, through the public Press, to be a slanderous production; but no statement which I have made has been disproved, and I dare the parties implicated rightfully to set aside any of the facts to which I have referred in this letter.

I have no doubt, Sir, that some of my former statements may have displeased your official Secretary, and I can well imagine what must be his feelings and those of the members of the Book Committee, when they are reminded by this communication of "THE FEELER;" of the unblushingly compromised; and of the shameful trifling with the liberties of the people, over whom they have been placed as religious examples and guides.

It is not a little remarkable, also, that during all this political manoeuvring among some of our leading preachers, we learn from official circulars issued

perfect tranquility and prospering in her way. Such circumstances were evidently calculated to lull suspicion, and to calm the apprehensions of our members, while hidden agencies were at work to endeavour to sway the popular mind for political purposes. I do not desire Sir, to insinuate that you would allow my statement to appear in your circulars, inconsistent with your conviction of the real condition of our body, but I presume that the advice of others is often received in issuing such documents, and it is more than intimated by certain parties connected with the College Board, (a "Family Compact") that your appointment to the Presidency, was merely a nominal one, and designed as a cloak to cover the political intrigues of your ministerial elders.

These, Sir, are statements of a grave character, and are not made in a moment of excited feeling, regardless of consequences, but under a calm conviction of duty—in plain language—and in the spirit of a Christian,—resolving confident that the cause I endeavour to advance is the cause of true religion—the cause of the Methodist Church—and particularly the cause of every LAW MEMBER of the body, and which, I feel satisfied, will be sustained by the voice of the entire membership.

I have alluded to the "princely liberality" of the Governor-General according to the statement of the late President of Victoria College, and for the sake of truth, and because many surmises are abroad concerning the finances of that Institution, would urge that a public statement be early given of its finances. Did the liberality of his Excellency bestow a private grant upon the Institution when "the Feeler" was thrown out by Mr. Ryerson and his condutors? And was there or was there not, an assurance also of a future continuance of Executive liberality—a reward perhaps for the political subservency of its managers? The Institution may thus be sustained by political or public funds, but it cannot, under such circumstances, be upheld by the continued confidence of the Methodist Church. The moral influence produced upon the minds of the youth by the knowledge of the circumstances to which I have referred, must tend, in a great degree, to neutralize the moral instruction given to them. The Methodist people have committed too much into the hands of the preachers, not only with respect to the finances of the Church, but with respect to the holding of its Chapel property; and past events, but particularly recent events, have pressed upon them the imperative necessity of providing some adequate remedy for the abuse of Ecclesiastical power—and that remedy will be LAW REPRESENTATION IN CONFERENCE. This simple remedy for the evils which have so long disturbed the peace and retarded the prosperity of our Church, is now, we rejoice to say, commanding the attention of our official members in other Circuits and Stations, and when the subject shall have been fully discussed, as I trust it will be prior to the next meeting of Conference, I feel assured that the whole body of the membership will stand up and with one voice claim the introduction of this most salutary and essential principle into the government of our community.

As I design, however, to refer to those latter measures in a future communication, I subscribe myself, in the meantime,

Your most obedient Servant,
A WESLEYAN METHODIST.
Cobourg, 1st November, 1841.

OUR CORRESPONDENTS, AND A FREE PRESS.

Of the benefits of a Free Press it is superfluous to say a word at the present time, as the advantages of it are universally admitted. But while these are acknowledged with reference to politics, and the general affairs of the world, we are aware that there are those who would decline the aid of the Press in matters of Religion, and particularly with regard to Church Government.

The Methodist Church has for many years resorted to the Press to disseminate religious knowledge, from the days of Wesley, whose pen was as prolific in cheap and valuable tracts, as the rest of his time was of equally useful labour. The Armenian or Methodist Magazine was established by him, and continues to this day. There is a Methodist Book Establishment in London, the amount of Books sold from which has yielded an annual profit of about £5,000. The Episcopal Methodist Church in the United States, abounds in excellent publications; and the Wesleyan Methodist Church in Canada follows those examples, having their Christian Guardian, and a large Book establishment.

Whatever, therefore, other Churches may do with regard to the use of the Press, the Conference of the Wesleyan Methodist Church cannot complain of the use of it among the members of the Church, while they keep their organ, they cannot object to their people having an Advocate. Our readers have no doubt just heard from the Missionary platform of the advantages of the Press in the circulation of the Holy Scriptures. The Press, we believe, was honoured in having the Bible almost for its first work, and Luther was indebted to it for the more rapid and extensive circulation of his Reform Doctrines. After these references to the use of the Press by the Wesleyan Methodist Church, will it be believed that any of the members of the Conference have commenced a species of opposition to our journal, and to those who patronise it, almost amounting to persecution. We have been informed that it has been saluted by some of them with epithets of no very complimentary nature—such as libellous, scurrilous, and slanderous. We have no great objection to these attacks because they show the strength of our position, and improve it.

When it becomes known throughout Western Canada, that the organ of the Conference dares not to meet the charges we have made against a few leaders of the Conference; this under current opposition will be regarded by the people with the same indifference as we regard it. When we have attacked them openly, without personality, and only desire truth to be proved, and to prevail on whichever side it may be found; when it is seen they can only reply by coarse epithets, and such kind of opposition as is implied in the following extracts from letters recently received from various parts of the province, we shall not say any thing to add to the mortification such persons will feel when they see the public are convinced that they have no other means of opposing this journal. They have a journal at their entire disposal, and have no excuse for concealed opposition; but they have neither facts nor arguments to put in it, in answer to those produced by us.

We vouch for the authenticity of the following extracts of a letter, just received:—The writer says, “you are aware that I am a business man, and you will not be surprised to learn, that the very fact of my opening my mouth on the subject of lay-Delegation, has enlisted the opposition of some of the Wesleyan Clergy, who have withdrawn themselves from my store, and have tried to induce others also. I despise such men, and I believe the day of high-handed rule is nearly at an end.”

For the consolation of such Gentlemen, we add, that the other side of the letter contained a long list of Subscribers to the “Wesleyan Methodist,” with remittances. The following is from another letter, “I send you five subscribers and remittance, and should have done so before, but was informed by a member of the Conference, that some of the causes that have brought forth the “Wesleyan” had been satisfactorily explained, and that those who were Mr. Wilkinson’s violent opposers, were now reconciled, and had become

his friends, and that the excitement was nearly allayed. I have also been informed by other members of the Conference, that it was of no use for us to agitate the question of lay-delegation; for we would never get it; and, that if every member of the Conference was in favour of it, they could not grant it, for it was contrary to discipline. I would ask what is discipline? Is it what it was fifteen years ago? Was it never altered?”

In the above extract we have quite a different description of opposition; here recourse is had to invention. We might after the example of one of the dominant nine, say a “*tissue of falsehoods*,” but we decline the use of such terms, we shall only say for the information of our correspondent, that no explanation of any kind has taken place, nor is there any excitement allayed. As to reconciliation with Mr. Wilkinson, and having become friends, there can be no reconciliation with him, as there was no personal opposition, at least none opposed to friendship; though we respect him personally, we feel it our duty to oppose the position he holds in the Conference. There is nothing to induce us to relax in our exertions to accomplish the object we have in view; so far from it, that instead of dropping our publication at the end of six months, our arrangements are nearly completed for its permanent continuance.

Those who wait to see its dissolution at the end of six months, and then, intend to come out *bravely* against a retired opponent, will be disappointed of the opportunity of exhibiting so much courage. Another correspondent writes, “We think highly of your paper, and hope that it will be well supported; such a paper is very much needed in our day and generation.”

Another writes, “I wish to say, that I was very much pleased to hear of your determination to endeavour to bring about a change of discipline, allowing Lay-Representatives a seat in Conference, as I believe it is the will of Heaven, and the undeniable right of the Laity, though long usurped by the Priesthood.”

Another, “Strong opposition here to your measures. Priestly influence determined.”

We have already exhibited many serious abuses of power on the part of the leaders of the Conference, and shown the nature of the opposition we are to meet with. We invite therefore, the co-operation of all the friends of religious liberty throughout the Methodist community. The question is, whether you will submit to a despotism, intolerable to every independent mind; as that is inevitable if you do not give us your hearty support. You know our motive to be pure and our object to be good, and that we make no individual profit of this journal; we undertake the pecuniary burden cheerfully, though it may be expensive for a few months. We do not believe that the liberal minded Methodists of Canada, will permit us to have this honour to ourselves. To the Societies in London, Brantford, Mount Pleasant, St. Catharines, Hamilton, Coburg, Port Hope, Prince Edward, Picton, Belleville, Bath, Kingston, &c, we say, aid us in our laudable

undertaking, read our journal for yourselves, and send us subscribers plentifully. We take this opportunity of acknowledging the receipt since our last, of letters with subscriptions and remittances, from the following places,—Cobourg, Hamilton, Nelson, Waterdown, York, Brantford, Dundas, Nasaguangun, Picton, Normandale, Cayuga, West Plamborough, Wellington Square, Colborne, St. John’s C. W., Darlington, Whitby, Napance, Cumberland, Buckingham, Grantham, Beamsville, Grimsby, and St. Catharines.

We also congratulate the friends of this undertaking, on the great success that has attended our publication for the first three months, and thank all its supporters, and trust that both they and we, may receive our reward in the accomplishment of the ultimate object of our undertaking—the purity, efficiency, and unity of the Wesleyan Methodist Church.

CHAIRMEN OF DISTRICTS AND THE MISSIONARY FUND.

In our last number we made a brief reply to a correspondent, on the subject of paying the Chairmen of Districts out of the Missionary money. We had then no space for any extended remarks on the subject: but, finding it necessary, we take the present opportunity to do so.

It appears, that the amount paid to the six Chairmen of Districts is £50, per annum, each. So far it is clear, that the sum of £300, per annum, is appropriated for this purpose, out of the amount raised for the Missionary cause. We have heard it stated, on good verbal authority, that the appropriation in question is an act of economy, and which is thus explained:—Formerly a Missionary agent was employed, but now that office was dispensed with, the duty being performed by Chairmen of Districts. Consequently, this payment out of the Missionary fund, relieve the respective Quarterly Meetings of a part of the amount formerly paid to the Chairmen of Districts. Both duties being discharged by the same persons, they are paid out of the separate funds appropriated for both, and neither, to the same amount as if a Missionary Agent had been employed.

If this is a true statement, and we have every reason to believe it is, it is our duty to object to the economy of such an arrangement. In the first place, there never was occasion for a Missionary Agent. If we are rightly acquainted with the history of our Church, that office is one of recent creation; the occasion of creating it arose accidentally, through a respected member of the Conference being either about to retire, or unable to take a regular circuit, and who, owing to eminent usefulness, was appointed Missionary Agent. At one time these duties were performed as they are now, and without any diminution of the Missionary fund for that service; therefore, it cannot be economy to pay additionally for the performance of duties which had been performed without such payment, until a Missionary Agent was appointed.

In the second place, that Missionary Agent had only £150 per annum, while the present

economical arrangement takes £300 per annum.

Besides, we have something to say about the general plan of proceeding in this business. It appears to us, that owing to the unpopularity of the office of District Chairmen, in the capacity of travelling Elders, and to the existence of great doubtfulness as to their utility at all, it has been the plan of the rulers of our Church to lessen the burden of the maintenance of Chairmen of Districts on the several Circuits.

About two years ago, the services of the Chairmen of Districts were so appreciated, that the office was abolished. At the last Conference it was revived. This doing and undoing speaks as little in favour of the unchangeableness of the Institutions of Methodism as of the wisdom of its present managers.

Notwithstanding the restoration of the office, neither its popularity nor utility has been improved by a two year's suspension; and, to render it palatable, *economy* is practiced, which in relation to the pecuniary burden on the Circuits, may be sufficiently made out; but, if it is not robbing Peter to pay Paul we are not able to describe it. The pecuniary burden on the people is increased by £150 per annum. The office of Missionary agent is abolished, as not being necessary, and £150 per annum saved, but the cost of two Missionary Agents is substituted, to make the office of Chairmen of Districts palatable to the people. At the same time the Chairmen must be paid somehow, to the amount that the several Circuits are eased.

We believe that there is no duty more important, on the Members of a Church, than to enquire, till they are fully satisfied, as to the appropriation of their contributions; and there is nothing that will have a tendency to raise the leading Members of the Conference in the esteem of the Members of the Church, than candid explanations when required, and the greatest publicity in general of the whole management of the finances entrusted to them. To leave things to be sought out is painful, if not suspicious.

It, therefore, ought to be a subject of enquiry, whether £50 per annum, out of the Missionary fund, is the actual expense of the deputations. If it is, why should it not be charged as travelling expenses, incidental to holding Missionary Meetings? If it is, why should it be made an annual charge, when it is incurred only in a period of a few weeks in each year? If it is, why should we find additional payments for the same purposes, as published in the Missionary Report for last year? We there find several payments for expenses of attending Missionary Meetings, amounting to £24.

It cannot fail to be observed, that the office of Chairman is a privileged office.

They are the rulers of the Conference—they govern the Church in their respective Districts—they know little of the hardships of a Missionary life—and if their respective Circuits cannot pay their salaries, the Missionary fund is available for them; while the junior Preachers and Missionaries are practising self-denial, by travelling from shanty to shanty in the wilderness, without privileges,

without sympathising friends, and without a friend to resort to in time of need.

But we have not only to complain of an encroachment on the Missionary fund, made to pay the salaries of Chairmen of Districts, but of several other misappropriations, which, in our opinion, cannot be defended. The Missionary Agent is still paid for the last year, out of the Mission funds, £168 14s., notwithstanding the *economy* of giving the Chairmen of Districts £300 for the performance of the same duties. A deficiency in the President's salary is, also, made up out of the same fund. This, last year, was £22 2s. 9d. An appropriation out of the same is made to the Contingent fund of £54. For special services, to the President and another, £23. And for a Physician's bill, to Mr McNab, £15, though he was paid the full amount of his salary besides. All these items ought to be explained, and we trust they will be.

It is too serious a matter to see out of the gross amount of the Missionary collection for the year, of £2,000, nearly £500, or one-fourth, appropriated to other purposes than the Missionary work. We ask the Members of the Church, who contribute the money, if such was their intention in subscribing? and we ask the Preachers, who conduct the Missionary Meetings, and plead the necessities of the Indians and destitute settlers, and the obligations of those better provided with the privileges of the Gospel, whether the misappropriation is not a breach of trust and faith.

Nor is this all we have to say on this subject. There is an entire departure from the Constitution of the Missionary Society. We ask, when was the General Meeting of the Society called? what number of Lay-men were present when the five Lay managers were chosen? The Constitution requires that these officers should be annually chosen by the Society, and that every contributor of £1 is a member, and, consequently, has a vote for the appointment of officers. In the absence of better information, we strongly suspect, that this whole business has been usurped by the same leading members of Conference who control the other affairs of the Church.

We feel it our duty, before closing this subject, to criticize the last Missionary Report, in reference to its financial statement.

We do not hesitate to pronounce it a falacious statement.

The Report shows a balance in the Treasurers hands, at the commencement of last year's account, and the same balance within £10 at the close of that account.

This has a fictitious appearance. It is equal to, and, consequently, in agreement with, having no balance in hand at all; for it is evident, that it has never been touched all the year through.

It is notorious, that at the close of the last Conference, that several of the Missionaries could not leave Toronto, for their respective Stations, because the Treasurer had not so much as £10 in hand! Where was the balance of £60 then?

Beside, by another admission in the same Report, the balance is stated to be only £453, that it was reduced to this to meet connexional

demands in England. The same Report states, that the sum of £302 was paid out of the balance of £760, and that it never came into the hands of the Treasurer, and still remains due to the Society. What is the use of this unnecessary confusion? when a plain statement might be made, which we believe to be nearly this:—That a balance being due from the British Missionary Committee to the Canada Missionary Society, and a debt for books being due from the Canada book concern to the British book concern, the former has been retained in payment of the latter, without the consent of the Treasurer of the Missionary Society. This alone solves the mystery of having paid this sum, and of never having received it, and of its being still due, and proves that the balance of £760 is fictitious. May we ask if this £302 has been repaid to the Missionary fund by the book concern?

Till this question is answered, we have the admission of the Treasurer of the Missionary Society, that £300 of the Missionary money has been appropriated to discharge a debt of the book establishment!

There is another item equally contradictory, or equally mysterious. The sum of £135 is stated to have been debited to the Treasurer, in a former Report, but never received; consequently, the Treasurer takes a credit for that amount in the last Report. What sort of a cash account must it be, to enter £135 that was never received? This shows the want of Auditors, chosen by the Members of the Church. We doubt whether the Lay-members of the Board of Management have performed their duty!

Our readers will think that we have been too severe in this article, against the Clerical managers of the Mission fund, but we have only performed a duty, though a painful one, nor have we fully performed it. We may yet have occasion to make further exposures, but we forbear. We hope we have said enough to awaken attention, and we find the spirit of enquiry spreading among the Members of the Church in every part of the Province. Even those who may not have made up their minds to go entirely with us, for a Lay-representation, will agree with us that the people have a right to see to the way in which their contributions are appropriated—that just and true accounts ought to be published—that there should be no confusion, or mystification—and no appropriation out of one fund, for other purposes, than those for which it is contributed.

We believe, notwithstanding, that these results will not be obtained without Lay-representation; and that, in the present article, we have materially added to the evidence in favour of it.

The Counsellor of Education, Von Turk, in his report asserts, that in Prussia, amongst 15,000 schoolmasters, are 12,000 who receive an amount to 100 thalers per annum. In the Hanoverian States, the annual income of 436 schoolmasters is not quite 26 thalers each: 786 have an income per annum of 51 thalers, and there are 1,477 whose income amounts to 75 thalers. In the district of the Altmark there are at this very day many who are called "wandering schoolmasters," who have no fixed schoolhouse, and who are obliged to instruct their young scholars at intervals, at the residence of the parents and friends of the children. The schoolmaster in general asks his money with the family in whose house school is fixed.—*Hamburg Paper.*

PRIMITIVE CHURCH GOVERNMENT AND LAY-REPRESENTATION.

"But he is not called Rabbi, for one is your Master, even Christ; and all ye are brethren."—Matt. xxiii, 8.

In discussing the rights of all the members of the Church to participate in the Government of it, it is hardly necessary to go further than to announce the portion of Holy Scripture at the head of this article. If all the disciples of Christ—if all the members of each particular community of Christians in any place are brethren; as they are on the highest authority declared to be, the whole matter is settled in favour of Lay-Representation, which is only a more convenient mode of giving every member a voice in the Councils of the Church. Instead, therefore, of our being under obligation to prove an equality of the members of the Christian Church with the ministers thereof, it behoves those who have assumed power to govern the Methodist Church in all its affairs to show their authority for this assumption of power.

It is probable that St. Peter foresaw the usurpation of the government of the Church by the elders, when he exhorted them to "*feed the flock of God, taking the oversight thereof, not by constraint, but willingly; not for filthy lucre, but of a ready mind; neither as being lords over God's heritage, but ensamples to the flock.*"

The beloved disciple, St. John, seems to have been of the same opinion, as shown in the notice he took of one Diotrephes. He says "*I wrote unto the Church; but Diotrephes, who loveth to have the pre-eminence among them, receiveth us not.*" Whether he withheld the Apostle's letter from the Church or not, considering it sent to himself personally, the Apostle does not inform us; but there is little doubt that he considered himself the Church; and was, apparently a good modern clergyman, but rather in advance of his age. He might at least have waited till the Apostles had disappeared; he had assumed authority to refuse to receive brethren, and to forbid others doing so, and to expel members of the Church.

We shall perhaps be opposed by another portion of scripture, which says, "*Obey them that have the rule over you, and submit yourselves, for they watch for your souls as they that must give account.*" This scripture is, in our opinion, quite irrelevant for we do not object to Government or to obedience and submission; but to a Government independent of the community,—to a Diotrephesian government, which is that of the Wesleyan Methodist Church.

However it is needless for us to call upon them for their authority for usurping the entire management of the affairs of the Church, as both they and we know that none can be produced. We shall therefore follow up the subject, and endeavour further to prove that the Government of the Primitive Church was administered by the whole of the members or disciples. There was no separation of Apostles, elders, or deacons from the rest of the community. No conference sitting with closed doors, and so grasping interference with all the secular matters of the Church. So far from this, that the Apostles found it necessary to lay the burden

of secular affairs on persons chosen by the community, that they might give themselves continually to prayer and to the ministry of the Word.

The first important act in Church Government, was the appointment of an Apostle to supply the vacancy made by the death of Judas. In our day this would be an interference which the laity would be willing to renounce, believing the Ministry most competent to perform such an important function. The election of an Apostle was thus conducted:—"*And in those days Peter stood up in the midst of the disciples, and said, Men and brethren, this Scripture must needs have been fulfilled, which the Holy Ghost by the mouth of David spake before concerning Judas.*" After reciting the prophecy and its fulfilment in the person of Judas, the Apostle continued:—"*Wherefore of these men which companied with us, all the time that the Lord Jesus went in and out among us, beginning at the Baptism of John, unto that same day that he was taken up from us, must one be ordained, to be a witness with us, of his resurrection.*" And they appointed two. After solemn prayer to God, the selection of one out of the two chosen by the people, was made by lot, in the person of Matthias.

At this time the number of disciples was about one hundred and twenty. The Apostle Peter addressed them on the subject of appointing another Apostle; one was chosen out of their own number and by themselves. This fact cannot be disputed, therefore at the first and most important meeting of the Church, the business was transacted by the whole community.

The next, important act of the Church, was the appointment of Deacons, Stewards or Servants of the Church in secular matters. This is concisely and clearly proved in the following words, Acts 6, v. 3-5: "*Wherefore brethren, look ye out among you seven men of honest report, full of the Holy Ghost and wisdom, whom we may appoint over this business.*" "*And the saying pleased the whole multitude, and they chose Stephen,*" and the whole seven as related.

Here again the whole of the Disciples were together, who selected their officers from among themselves, to whom was committed the secular affairs of the Church, expressly that the Apostles might be relieved of the encumbrance of them; that they might give themselves continually to prayer and to the ministry of the word. How happily those holy men must have gone to their spiritual labour, after being released from the responsibility of these secular affairs. No doubt very differently from what they would have done, had they insisted on their authority to manage things as they pleased, or to depute whom they pleased in their stead. An authority, which, in our opinion, they could have exercised with better right than any of their successors.

The next important affair was to decide whether the Gentile Christians should observe the laws of Moses. This question seems to have been amply debated by the whole Church, with the Apostles and Elders, and no doubt, with considerable feeling on

both sides, the Jewish Christians being very zealous for the laws of Moses, while Paul and Barnabas, both Jews, must have appeared to be opposed to them. This debate ended in a resolution as follows:—"*Then it pleased the Apostles and Elders, with the whole Church to send chosen men of their own company to Antioch, with Paul and Barnabas, and Silas, chief men among the brethren, and they wrote letters by them after this manner. The Apostles, and Elders, and Brethren, send greeting, &c. &c.*" The letter in question, contains the following expressions bearing on our argument. "*It seemed good unto us being assembled with one accord, to send chosen men unto you,*" "*For it seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us, to lay upon you no greater burden than these necessary things. That ye abstain from meats offered to idols, and from blood, and from things strangled and from fornication.*"

In this transaction the members of the Church were equal with the Apostles in the authority to send forth special missionaries, and to issue a decree binding on the consciences of the Gentile Converts. To this the Holy Ghost gave Divine authority, associating in the decree with the members of the Church. Surely, if God could condescend to associate the members of the Church with himself, in the exercise of such power, it is no degradation of the members of the Methodist Conference, to admit their lay brethren to a similar association with themselves in the government of the Church.

We have in the three instances just referred to in the history of the Primitive Church, examples of the whole administration of Church Government, or evidently the most important functions of it being performed by the Church,—the multitude,—the disciples or brethren, and we have no instance of the separate exercise of authority by the Ministers only.

The brethren appointed an Apostle, they chose Deacons or Stewards to manage the secular affairs of the Church. They sent out special Missionaries, and wrote letters, containing decrees binding on the conscience of Christians.

When it is considered that, to all these acts of the disciples, the Holy Ghost gave his sanction, we ask, who can have the temerity to forbid the members of the Church taking part in the management of the funds contributed by themselves, or to have a voice in the question as to what Church they are to belong to, or whether the chapel property, built by their subscriptions and their labours, is to belong to others—to be alienated without their consent or even without consulting them? We have not yet heard of any special pretensions being made by the Methodist Clergy, as to their being true successors of the Apostles, we believe all Ministers of the Gospel are, just in the degree that they partake of the Holy Spirit, by which the Apostles were most distinguished. If such are the pretensions of the Methodist Clergy, they ought for consistency to imitate the Apostles in associating the members of the Church with themselves in the management of its affairs; that they might give themselves con-

tinually to prayer, and the Ministry of the Word. We long to see this principle established in Methodism: if it were, we have no doubt, after the very first year, there would be a large increase in the number of members of the Church, the Missionary contribution would be at least double what it is now, and the people, stirred up by such a praiseworthy example, would come willingly to their help on all occasions, and neither Victoria College nor any other of the Connexional Funds, would require replenishment from the Government Treasury.

Similar views of Church Government corresponding to lay-representation, are held by multitudes of our fellow christians, under the Presbyterian and Congregational systems; even the Church of England commits a large part of its management to the laity, and there is a prospect of additional concession being made to them. We might shew the absurdity of the assumption of the Clergy to govern the Church absolutely by supposing that on the occasions which we have alluded to in the history of the Church, that as to the first, Peter had risen up with the eleven only, and spoken to this effect:—The choice of a successor, to Judas, being a very important affair, it rests only with the eleven to appoint one; consequently a council of the Apostles must be held, the multitude must be excluded, as we do not wish them to hear and discover all our motives. It being desirable to retain our power, as ignorant multitudes cannot justly appreciate the most important matters of Church Government. The same might have been said with equal propriety in relation to the choice of deacons, and with much more apparent reason as to the decree binding on the Church at Antioch; but even in the last the multitude were as much consulted as in the others.

In the demand made by us for lay-representation, the object is not that the lay-representatives should interfere in the spiritual duties of Ministers, during the sittings of Conference. They do not wish to be made members of the Conference, so much as representatives of the people on all subjects of which the people are judges, and in which they are interested. Therefore it is not required that these representatives should be educated for the Ministry, to enable them to take part in the deliberations of the Conference. But the Clergy should be the last to object to lay-representatives as being ignorant of many subjects connected with the duties of the Conference, while themselves are not a distinct class from the people, but were selected out of them; and if the people are ignorant who is to blame, but the Clergy who are paid for teaching them. Surely they do not mean to underrate their own success so much as to admit, there there is none among the laity sufficiently well informed to be worthy of a seat in the Conference!

But when we consider the ignorance of the multitude in the Apostolic age, there being few books, no printing, and no general system of education, the Clergy of the present day have little excuse in preventing lay members from taking part in the Government of the Church; who are not inferior in knowledge

to themselves, and with regard to some subjects in which they are engaged, much better informed.

We do not believe that the Methodist Clergy can justly be charged with holding the doctrine of Apostolic Succession in the Priesthood, and of the indelible character of ordination. But we shall give the following extract from a celebrated writer of the last century, who wrote before the Methodist body was in existence, leaving the reader to judge whether it is not inconsistent in them to oppose the pretensions of the Clergy of the Church of England, while they advance as far in the same principles as the age and the institutions of Methodism will permit.

"It is undeniably proved by numerous texts of scripture, that no one Christian has more power than another: that the Holy Ghost fell upon all believers alike, and that they had all the power of doing miracles after they had received the Holy Ghost. We are so far from being told in Holy Writ, that elders, pastors, and teachers (for all priesthood is plainly abolished by our Saviour in any other sense than as all christians are Priests) are always to choose one another; that even an Apostle, in the first of the Acts, is chosen by the congregation."—*British Journal*, 1723.—*Cato's Letters*.

THE NEXT PRESIDENT OF THE CONFERENCE.

We hear it rumored, that the Rev. Mr. Scott, late editor of the *Guardian*, is likely to fill the important office of President of the Conference. We do not wonder at the selection of a person who so ably, faithfully, and consistently fulfilled the duties of editor of the *Guardian*; and we predict with assurance, that a similar testimony will be recorded in relation to the office of President.

We highly approve of the selection of Mr. Scott; and we are sure, that the great body of the Ministry and Membership will be of our opinion. His appointment cannot fail to be popular, nor the duties of it effectually performed.

The question suggests itself, how will the Rev. Mr. McNab like this, after the attack made by him on the reputation of Mr. Scott, during the sittings of Conference of last year?

We have, hitherto, abstained from giving any gratuitous opinion on this subject; but the above report having reached us, it has become our duty to make a few observations on the occasion.

When we speak in confidential anticipation in favour of Mr. Scott, as President, we particularly mean to say, that there will be no resort, on his part, to any species of manoeuvring to influence the votes of the members of Conference.

We are far from being able to say that this was not the case in the attempt of certain members to carry into effect the plans of Dr. Ryerson, their political leader. Many of the most upright and undesigning, among the junior Preachers, will remember how assiduously Mr. McNab drew their attention to the necessity of a change in the editorial manage-

ment of the *Guardian*, with reference to its literary character.

This was the ostensible reason given for a change in the editorship; but the real intention undeniably was, the removal of Mr. Scott, to place a more pliant individual in his place—more at the disposal of the nine, with Dr. Ryerson at their head.

As a proof of this, we give the following extract from the *Guardian*, published while Mr. Scott was editor, which speaks for his fidelity. We have reason to believe, that Mr. Buchanan's letters would have been inserted in the *Guardian*, had it not been for his interference:—

Mr. Buchanan's Letters.—Various prejudicial rumours being in circulation, respecting the non-insertion in our paper, of Mr. Buchanan's long Letters on Ministerial affairs, we think it proper to set our readers right in the matter. We saw that the letter was inserted by many of our contemporaries, and are aware that they were very handsomely remunerated for their trouble; and our fear was, that it would be offered to us for publication, when we did not want it. Offered it was, and we refused it. It is true, that its publication, as an advertisement, would have brought a large sum into the coffers of the Conference establishment; it is true that that sum, and the profits on many extra copies of our paper, would have amounted perhaps to £60 or £70; but we rejected the money for the sake of principle. And, why? Simply because of the non-political, non-party position of the *Christian Guardian*. While we bear the weighty, yet welcome, responsibilities of the management of that paper,—so long as the express and wise direction of the Conference to us is—Meddle not at all with party politics, we shall shun them, as we have scrupulously done during the four years it has been our honour to conduct this journal. Neither policy, nor smiles, nor frowns, nor pay shall induce or compel the present editor of the *Guardian* to violate the laws, and commit the sacred and dearest interests of his Conference, or debase and degrade the unblemished and lofty character of the Wesleyan-Methodist Church.

We can imagine an incipient blush, indicative of rising shame and self condemnation, on the part of Mr. McNab, when he meets his injured brother, in a place when to face him is unavoidable. Our readers will think, perhaps, that we are too hard upon Mr. McNab, but we know too much of him, in his capacity of auxiliary to Dr. Ryerson, in the objectionable system of trafficking the influence of the community for Government aid in money; besides, we have nothing personal against Mr. McNab, nor have we against any other Minister of the Church.

We regard them as public characters, and the object of our journal is, to criticize public conduct, and to expose in them what we know and believe to be injurious to the Church.

The other Candidate for the Presidency, we hear, is the present Secretary of the Conference, who will, of course, have the support of his brethren of the nine. Mr. Scott, however, will be the unbiased choice of the numerical majority, as well as of the advocates of the best interests of Methodism.

Should, however, Dr. Ryerson return from Europe in time to meet the Conference, Mr. Scott's election may be doubtful, as all such appointments are under the control of him, whom some call the *Bunting*, and others the *John Toronto*, of Methodism.

How long will the majority of the Conference submit to the despotic rule of one individual?

Extent of the Solar System.—The mind fails to form an exact notion of a portion of space so immense; but some faint idea of it may be obtained from the fact, that if the swiftest race-horse ever known had begun to traverse it, at full speed, at the time of the birth of Moses, he would only as yet have accomplished half his journey.

CHAPEL PROPERTY.

We are quite aware, that our article, on this subject, in the February number, required further explanation. The obscurity of it arose from an error, discovered when it was too late to rectify it sufficiently.

We intended to show the position in which the members of the Wesleyan Methodist Church were placed, relative to their chapel property, and asserted, that with the absolute ownership of that property by the Conference, there was no security for the integrity, purity, and permanency of Methodism in Canada, under the management of the leaders of the Conference of the Wesleyan Methodist Church; we added, that should Dr. Ryerson return with fresh impressions, with his power in the Conference, he might do anything. We also stated, that more than the exclusive use of the chapels is insisted on by the leaders of the Conference.

The error we committed, was in referring this subject specially to the deed of settlement for the chapel property, which has but a remote connection with the deed of settlement.

We have only to suppose, that on the occasion of the dissolution of the Union in 1840 the contract of union then subsisting had been broken by the Wesleyan Methodist Church, instead of the British Missionary Committee, what would have been the effect on the chapel property?

Every portion of it would have become the property of the British Conference!

Our readers will recollect, that it afforded Dr. Ryerson and the Conference, at that time, strong grounds of congratulation to the members of the Church, that all the chapel property was secured to the Conference, because the British Conference were the party who broke up the union. We need only refer to the litigation in the cases of the Belleville and Waterloo Chapels, for another illustration and proof of this fact. It was because that the identity of the Methodist Episcopal Church in Canada with the Wesleyan Methodist Church was not proved, or not admitted by the court (we do not know which), that those two chapels were awarded to the latter. With reference to them, worthy and pious men had subscribed, collected subscriptions, and built chapels, fondly imagining that they had secured a spiritual asylum for themselves and their children, during their earthly pilgrimage.

But what was the consequence? how did they lose that property? certainly, in equity, more theirs than the property of any one else; they lost it because of a change in the designation, government, and discipline of the body to which they belonged, made without their consent, and without consulting them, and which occasioned their separation.

We ask the members of the Wesleyan Methodist Church if they think it safe to remain exposed to a similar event?

They are now exposed to it; and, in 1840, were within an hair's breadth of losing the whole of their chapel property!

It is true the Conference advocates, if they have any, may say, the property would not

have been alienated in such a case, it would have remained the property of the Conference still. Here is the difficulty, the vital question we have to deal with in relation to this property.

When a religious community raise funds, by great exertions and sacrifices, and build a house of prayer, for themselves, and their families, and their neighbours, and in intention, for generations to come, whose do they suppose is the property, theirs or that of the Conference?

When a deed is executed, vesting the said property in trustees, for the exclusive use of the Conference of the Wesleyan Methodist Church; do they consider that the Conference are to be deemed the absolute owners of it? No! The Conference do not go so far as this, in theory at least. Is there not, in the trust deed, a virtual contract, that the Conference shall have the use of the property on condition? Are not some of these conditions, that the Conference shall abide by the discipline, and all the institutions of Methodism, and that the Conference shall continue the same body? But if the Conference alter their designation, and their relation to other branches of the general Methodist body, and become, as decided by courts of justice, divested of property, or possessors of property in consequence of that change, either in their discipline or in their relation to other bodies of Methodists, or become another body, are not these conditions violated? Under these circumstances a community do not know who they are building a chapel for, ultimately.

This was the situation of the Belleville and Waterloo people, and this would have been the situation of all the property now held by the Wesleyan Methodist Church, if the Conference had violated the articles of union, instead of the British Missionary Committee.

Our readers, therefore, will, no doubt, admit, that we are correct in not wishing the ordinary deed of trust to be altered, in reference to the Conference having the exclusive use of the chapel property; and, that we are correct in desiring an alteration to the effect, that the Conference shall not be allowed to alter the designation it had when the particular property was invested for their use, nor alter their relation to other branches of the Methodist body, or become any other body, nor depart from the institutions and discipline of the Conference, in effect, at the time of such investment, nor make any change affecting the ownership of the chapel property, without consulting the members of the Church. This alteration of the deed is imperative and immediately called for, as in the event of any contemplated union, the chapel property will go with the body created by that union, and be lost to all that may separate in consequence of that union, as well as to all the rest on its dissolution.

Such an alteration of the deed, however, will only affect chapels to be hereafter built, and we strongly recommend that, in all such cases, no steps should be taken towards the settlement of newly built chapels, till the parties, for whom they are erected, are secured from the danger we have pointed out

and made safe and sure that they are not subscribing and building chapels for other parties as in the cases of Belleville and Waterloo.

But there is no security that the present chapel property shall abide under its present ownership, to be enjoyed in accordance with the intentions and expectations implied in contracts existing when they were erected, but that which may be afforded by the interference of the people themselves. We think that Lay-representation is the only preventative of this danger; and we are certain, that if the system of Lay-representation comes into operation, the chapel property will not be in danger of being alienated, by means of an union hereafter to be made or dissolved.

THE CAUSE OF AND REMEDY FOR DIVISION.

We have been induced to call the attention of our readers to this subject, from the circumstance, that one of our late numbers was returned to us, having the following words written on the margin:—

"Mark them who cause divisions among you and avoid them.—P. PETERSON."

This quotation seems to be designed to convey to us a reproof, although it might have been, with equal propriety, employed to encourage and stimulate us in the painful but necessary service upon which we have entered.

As a reproof we receive it; and, in the spirit of wisdom and charity, would we refer to it. If we have, in any particular, erred from the straight path of duty, either by entering upon the onerous task of endeavouring to bring about an ecclesiastical reformation, or by the manner in which our labours have been conducted, and if our friend (for such we presume he is) designs, by a reference to divine authority, to convince us of our error, and to bring us back to the right way, he deserves not only our unfeigned gratitude but our sincere thanks. We freely admit the value of reproof, when given with such wisdom and clearness as that it may correct by convincing the judgement, but our friend will allow, that it may be given unwisely—out of season, and, therefore, be unprofitable and vain.

The language of the reproof is taken from Paul's Epistle to the Romans; but, being disjointed from its connection, fails to convey the Apostle's meaning, and may be wrested to produce an impression directly at variance with his design.

The divisions condemned by the Scripture, are clearly defined; but, in the quotation, are not specified. The language of the Epistle is, "Now I beseech you, brethren, mark them who cause divisions and offences, contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned; and avoid them."

The words in italics are essential to our apprehending the design of the Apostle, yet they are entirely overlooked, or put aside by Mr. Peterson in his quotation, which condemns all division indiscriminately, while the words of the Apostle condemn such only as are contrary to sound doctrine. We desire fully, and at all times, to yield ourselves to the counsel here given; and if our friend will meet us in calm scriptural argumentation, upon the ground we have taken, in defence of the Christian hierarchies of our people, as a Church, we will, with much pleasure, publish his communications. There are none who more sincerely desire unity, and love peace, than we do, yet we will never consent to purchase the one or the other, at the expense of principle. We are not ignorant of the influence of the faithful with respect to this; and are prepared, as good soldiers, to endure the reproach of the Cross. The ambassadors of Christ were not only charged with creating division, but with "turning the world up side down!" They invaded, by their preaching, the peace of families, of societies, and of nations. Mark the scenes of riot, confusion, and uproar which often attended their labours; and, as a consequence, the sufferings to which they were exposed, by the desertion of friends, the fury of the populace, and the severity of the civil magistrates, yet they laboured still, and only ceased this work of division when their eyes were sealed for death.

division, therefore, we desire largely to create among us, because it is Scriptural, spiritual, healthful, purifying, and essential to our highest well being, and yields, in the end, a large and abundant harvest of purity and peace. Who would not prefer the sparkling torrent dividing itself into a thousand streams as it falls from the rocky steep, diffusing every where freshness, beauty, and fertility, throughout the vale, to the unbroken stillness, and silence, and pestilential air of the stagnant marsh? and who would not prefer the divisions created by enkindling the thoughts of a religious community, and leading them to range at large throughout the ample domain of divine truth, to the unity and quietude—the torpor and corruption, resulting from a humiliating subjection to human opinions and unscriptural usages?

The occasion of the apostolic injunction was that divisions had arisen among the Churches in that day, by certain false teachers, who had taught things contrary to the doctrines of the Gospel. On one occasion, indeed, so great was the division created by those teachers, that the Apostle Paul himself and certain others were delegated to go up to Jerusalem to submit the questions in dispute to the brethren there, in order that the minds of the Gentile converts might be established in the faith. This was a period of vast interest to the Gentiles, to know whether, as Christians, they were bound to be circumcised and keep the ceremonial law. The case was submitted to the Church at Jerusalem, and the counsel which was given to stay the division created by the false teachers, inculcating erroneous doctrines, and enforcing unscriptural usages, appears to us of the greatest importance and illustrative of the means which we should employ to stay unscriptural divisions amongst us. Mark the language:—"Then pleased it the Apostles and Elders with the whole Church to send chosen men of their own company to Antioch, &c. &c.—And they wrote letters by them after this manner:—The Apostles, and Elders, and Brethren send greeting, &c., &c. "For it seemeth good to the Holy Ghost and to us, to lay upon you no greater burden than those necessary things; that ye abstain from meats offered to idols, and from blood, and from things slaughtered," &c. This question might have been settled, according to human judgment, by apostolic authority alone, or at least by the apostles and elders; but it was not, by one, nor by both united; but by the whole church, "the Apostles, and Elders, and Brethren." The procuring cause of almost all the divisions and offences which distract the Churches at the present day is the evident departure they have made from the ecclesiastical government taught throughout the New Testament, the grand principle of which is involved in the decision above referred to. That decision was given equally by the lay members, as by the inspired apostles and elders, yet we, as a Church, have long commended the whole legislation and supreme government of the body to a community of teachers, a select number of uninspired men,—to the entire exclusion of the Membership and in direct opposition to the authority and examples given in the Word of God. Every departure from the path marked out by that word is accompanied by its corresponding evils, and we have experienced this to a large extent. The power given to our leading preachers contrary to the doctrine of the Apostles of the Son of God has caused divisions and offences which not only tend to subvert the whole Methodist Society but is fast reducing the body to a mere political machine, capable of being wrought to subserve the worldly purpose of a few individuals or wicked men. It is thus that Egerton Ryerson and his political confederates have disturbed our peace and marred our prosperity; but awakened as we now are, to our danger and our duty, we shall endeavour to remove the evil by the removal of its cause. Instead of committing the government of the Church to the preachers alone, we shall labour to have it committed equally into the hands of the preachers and brethren, according to the authority of the Word of God.

It may be that our preachers will cling to their unlawful power, contrary to the truth, contrary to the wishes of the brethren, and contrary to the unity and peace of the Church, but we will remind them, and our friend and counsellor, Mr. Peterson, that every intelligent reader of his bible will "mark them who cause divisions and offences contrary to the doctrine"

of the apostles of Christ, and will avoid them, and let them ponder the language of the supreme Lawgiver and head of the Church:—"It must needs be that offences come, but woe to that man by whom they come."

CHURCH AND STATE.

Puseyism v. Fire Insurance.—Dissenters are cautioned how they manage their property in offices with the articles of which they have not made themselves acquainted. A Dissenter lately insured in a London Fire-Office, and had the misfortune to be burnt out. In the policy of Insurance was a clause, that the minister and churchwardens of the parish shall certify or declare that the fire has happened by a simple accident. Being a Dissenter, and opposed to church-rates, and because the minister really does not know whether the fire took place by accident or design, the minister and churchwardens refuse to make the declaration. Counsel have been consulted upon this clause, and it is said to be fatal to the goodness of the claim.—*London Railway Bell and Illustrated Advertiser.*

A hitch is said to have occurred between the Bishop of London and Sir Robert Peel, respecting the extensive parish of St. George, Hanover-square—the Premier wishing to have it divided into three sections, and the Bishop being anxious to retain it in its present position, for his own sake. The prelate has, doubtless, well considered the apostolic doctrine, and has determined to regulate his own conduct by the rule:—"If any man provide not for his own, and especially for those of his own house, he has denied the faith, and is worse than an infidel."—*Liverpool Chronicle.*

Ecclesiastical Court Adjudications.—What will the ladies say to the adjudication of the Ecclesiastical Court in the case of *Dysart v. Dysart*? It is to them exceedingly edifying. It does not go the length of recommending the stick to the husband "not larger than the thumb," Judge Butler's law, but it comes pretty near it. A husband has been pronounced all that can be inimical to conjugal affection—all that can make the marriage his uncomfortable. "He was not justified in his gross, and the court must say, infamous, conduct," &c.: but no matter, Lady Dysart seems to have been wanting in submission; if he want of obedience, after many years of separation, and after certain acts which, not being in the present case, the court could not go into.

The principal question being, if such an act of cruelty had occurred on the 23rd of January, 1837, as would revive previous acts of cruelty alleged to have been committed by the Earl of Dysart, and by which, it proved, Lady Dysart would be entitled to a divorce. The Court would take the facts in the order as stated in the case. A full reference was here made by the learned judge to the separate allegations of cruelty, commencing as early, as pleaded, as 1823. It was quite clear that the affection between the parties had somewhat changed.

After certain violent scenes, particularly a "rush-light scene" all showing that not a particle of affection survived between the parties, the court observed, no doubt according to ecclesiastical law:—

"Were there any reasonable grounds of danger to the life of Lady Dysart if the court ordered her to return to cohabitation? If the Court did not think so, it could not pronounce a decree in her favour."

There did not appear to be any, and Lady Dysart, after years of separation, must return and spend her days in any misery short of that. This is no doubt the law, Ladies, or it would not have been so laid down. Kicks and cuffs you must sustain, and "love and obey" still. You have no rights—you are children upon whom the thumb-stick may be used!

But apart from this case, what are ecclesiastical courts but remnants of absurd legislation. An unhappy couple must live and love together by law. Natural aversion goes for nothing. Under pains and penalties people must "love and cherish" each other, if the Court says they must. The Inquisition orders that a man believe a certain faith to conviction, under the penalty of burning. Both decisions are alike. They deal not with tangible facts, but with mental affections. It is far better that a couple, heartily hating each other, should live separate. The present case shows that a married woman is a slave to all intents and purposes.—*Railway Bell, &c.*

Puseyism Justified by a Bishop.—The Bishop of Exeter's judgment in the matter of the charges against Mr. Blunt, the curate of Helston, is a subject of too much consequence, in various points of view, to be dismissed or in a summary manner. The public will learn from it that a curate is right in refusing to bury with the Church service, persons baptized by Dissenters—in refusing to marry persons unless they can show that they have been baptized by clergymen of the Church of England—in refusing to pray—refusing to use the universal prayer of the Christian, with a parishioner and a fellow churchman, because the poor man had been baptized by a Romanist priest in Ireland! Not because we cannot be "in communion" with Rome—not because Rome is a false religion, but because an Anti-Christian Church

as vulgar low churchmen hold—but simply because a Romanist in the United Kingdom is a schismatic, according to the interpretation which the Rev. Mr. Blunt, in the exercise of his "private judgment," puts on the legal effect of certain transactions which occurred three centuries ago! They will learn too, that the more intense the feeling of discontent excited in the minds of some churchmen who have the misfortune to be under the care of such fanatics, by these wretched acts of bigotry—the more utter the disturbance and interruption of spiritual comfort to others, pious and humble church goers who take no part in the Theological contests of the day, by the endless succession of unmeaning changes in the ritual, by the monotonous bitterness of weekly denunciations against schism, by the violence of manner and language, the travails, the scandalous imprecations which are certain to follow the ministrations of such a man—the more determined constance and support the clergyman is sure to find from his diocesan, if he have the felicity to be planted within the diocese which enjoys the superintendency of Bishop Phillips.—*London Globe.*

Invention of Steam Navigation.—It appears from a printed circular which has just been published that the merit of this discovery is due to a man named Taylor, a native of Cromwell, who first succeeded in propelling a boat by steam, in the year 1783. In acknowledgment of his claim, a pension of £50 per annum was settled upon his widow, by Government, and a donation of £50 was subsequently made to each of his four surviving sisters; but as this is justly deemed a poor remuneration for such important services, it is suggested that a national testimonial should be made to the family of Mr. Taylor.—*Northern Whig.*

Schoolmasters in France.—According to a statistical account published this year by order of the Minister of Commerce, it appears that in the ten years from 1833 to 1843, the state expended for the maintenance of 10,933 convicts a sum of 2,400 francs, being an average of 82 centimes per day for each, whereas, in several of the departments, the salary and emoluments of the teachers of public schools do not amount to eighty centimes per day.—*Galignani.*

The Growth of a Village.—The village of Oquawka, on the Upper Mississippi, was laid out in 1836. At the time, provisions of every sort had to be imported for the consumption of settlers. Now the tide has turned, and the insignificant village, within the present year, has made to St. Louis, and other markets, the following exports:—3,353 barrels of pork and lard, 121 barrels of beef, 2,581 barrels flour, 40,000 bushels wheat, 61 bales hemp, 3 casks wool, 200 hhdts. tobacco, a large quantity of corn, oats, hemp, seed, hides, peltries and other articles.

Danger of employing ignorant Medical Practitioners.—Verdict of Man-slaughter against a Cancer Doctor.—Mary Harris, a native of Wem, Salop, died at Birkenhead, recently, while under the care of a person named Port. She had had a cancer in her breast. The Salop Jury held an inquest on the body, and found that she had died of cancer. Mr. Churton, the Coroner for the southern division of Cheshire, held another inquest on the body, which was exhumed, at Monk's Ferry, on the 4th, and by adjournment on the 13th instant. The evidence, which was very voluminous, was to the effect, that deceased came to lodge with Mrs. Jane Gwynn on the 10th October, last, and placed herself under the care of Mr. Port, who attended her day by day and prescribed for her. He gave her medicine, and applied plasters and poultices to her breast; and the deceased continued to complain, day by day of a burning sensation on the seat of the disease, until the day she died. The body was conveyed home and interred. After the interment, a post mortem examination of the body was made by Surgeon Barnes Vaughan, residing at Birkenhead, who gave evidence to the effect, that the tumor in the breast could not have caused the death of the deceased; but that it resulted from the inflamed appearances of the different structures of the body, and that those appearances might have arisen from the absorption of arsenic or mercury. Dr. Brett, professor of chemistry to the Royal Institution, Liverpool, was then called in; and the stomach, intestines, and breast were given to him for analysis; and he applied all the various tests known, and detected small portions of arsenic in the breast and stomach, liver and spleen. He also analyzed some powders given to the deceased, which he found to consist of nitre, carbonate of soda, oxide of iron, and a little vegetable substance. Some pills consisted of rhubarb, soda, and a resinous substance, the whole triturated with oil of peppermint. The contents of a bottle were also analysed, but contained only opium with no metallic substances. Dr. Brett expressed a strong opinion that arsenic must have been applied to the breast of the deceased, and become absorbed into the system. The jury returned a verdict of man-slaughter against Mr. Port, who was committed on the coroner's warrant for trial at the next assizes.—*Liverpool Chronicle.*

Just as we were going to press with the present number, we received additional communications, with subscriptions and remittances, which we have not space to acknowledge in detail. We shall do so in our next number.