

WESLEYAN CONFERENCES OF ENGLAND AND CANADA:

CONTAINING ALL THE

OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS

OF

BOTH BODIES AND THEIR REPRESENTATIVES,

DOWN TO OCTOBER 28th, 1840.

INCLUDING ALSO

THE REV. E. RYERSON'S REPLY TO THE REV. MESSRS.
STINSON AND RICHEY'S PAMPHLET—PUBLISHED
BY REQUEST OF THE CONFERENCE.

"Buy the truth, and sell it not."

Toronto:

CONFERENCE OFFICE, 9, WELLINGTON BUILDINGS.

J. H. LAWRENCE, PRINTER.

1840.

R E P O R T

OF THEIR MISSION TO ENGLAND, BY THE REPRESENTATIVES
OF THE CANADA CONFERENCE.

*To the Conference and Members of the Wesleyan-Methodist
Church in Canada.*

HONOURED AND DEAR BRETHREN :

Having been duly appointed by our Brethren assembled in Conference in June last, as their Representatives to the Wesleyan Conference in England, we immediately proceeded on our Mission, and laid, as far as circumstances would permit, the several subjects committed to us before the Wesleyan Conference assembled at Newcastle-upon-Tyne, in August. The result was, that the Wesleyan Conference in England has refused to abide any longer by the Articles of Union into which it entered in 1833 with the Conference of the Wesleyan Methodist Church in Canada. This proceeding affects, in no respect whatever, any part of the Discipline or Institutions of the Church in Canada—it simply leaves our Conference, Ministers and People, to pursue, in their own way, without any further interference on the part of the Conference in England, the great work of cultivating the Vineyard of their Divine Master, and their various plans of Christian enterprise for the religious and moral improvement of Upper Canada; whilst it involves the English Conference in the responsibility and consequences of a formal *Secession* from deliberately adopted and regularly ratified Articles of Agreement with the Conference of the Wesleyan Methodist Church in Canada.

The causes and circumstances of an event so extraordinary in its character and so important in its consequences, are worthy of serious attention; and a brief narrative of them, and of the manner in which we have discharged the duties imposed upon us in relation to them, is due to those by whom we were appointed, and cannot fail to interest the Members of our Church generally, and a large portion of the Canadian Public.

It is known to all the Members of our Conference, and is clear from the Correspondence which took place in 1831 and 1832, between our Missionary Board and the Wesleyan Missionary Committee in London, that the Union was suggested on our part, in the first place, not as a measure desirable in

itself, but as expedient,—to prevent the disgrace and evils of collision between two regular branches of the Wesleyan family; and that it was not proposed by our Conference until after the failure of every possible persuasion and remonstrance to induce the Conference in England to continue the same fraternal arrangements with the Church in Canada, in its position as an independent Body within the Province, free from any foreign ecclesiastical control, as they had done for many years, by a formal agreement, with the American General Conference, when our Societies were connected with the Methodist Episcopal in the United States. The arrangement, however, which the Conference in England adopted and observed in regard to Upper Canada while we had a connexion with the United States Methodist Conference, the Wesleyan Missionary Committee in London refused to observe after the dissolution of that foreign ecclesiastical connexion. Under such circumstances, our Conference suggested the propriety of a formal co-operation between the English and Canada Conferences—hoping thereby to prevent the anomaly and mischief of establishing rival pulpits, societies and interests, and to secure the accession of an additional amount of piety, experience, talent, and means to our then rapidly expanding operations for the conversion of the Indian Tribes, and the religious instruction of the new settlements.

Such were the circumstances which gave birth to the proposition of the Union on the part of our Conference; and such were the objects contemplated by it. In carrying out that measure, and with a view to promote the Christian and benevolent objects which we contemplated by it, concessions of different kinds and on different occasions were made in deference to the views and feelings of the Committee in London, which exposed the motives of our Conference to imputations, and its character to attacks, from different quarters, and alienated not a few individuals from our communion and congregations.

But it now appears, from indubitable evidence, that the Missionary Secretaries in London, and other Members of the English Conference, had also other and unavowed objects in view in recommending and adopting the Articles of Union; objects the contemplation and pursuit of which have obviously prevented that harmonious and successful operation of the Union which was anticipated by its friends and advocates in Canada. These objects were,—the gradual extinction of every sort of influence as identified with the Canada Conference—the transfer of that influence into other channels and into other hands—and the absolute supremacy of the Committee and Conference in England over all the Departments and Institutions of the Church in Canada. The Union seems to have been chiefly preferred and adopted by the Missionary Secretaries in London as, in their judgment, the most feasible and expeditious method of rendering all the labours, and fruits, and influences of Methodism in Canada tributary to the establishment of their own complete ascendancy and control over every thing connected with that name. This was in substance avowed by Mr. Alder, and more explicitly stated by others in the late Conference in England, and was disputed by none; and it will be found to be embodied in Resolutions of the English Conference.

Now, to a certain extent and upon certain principles, we offer no objection to the contemplation and pursuit of such objects. Superior piety, wisdom,

intelligence, self-denial, zeal, labours and success, must and ought to command superiority of influence and authority in every community united by voluntary rules and upon moral principles. But this authority does not and ought not to consist in the letter of written rules in a Christian Church, but in the power of moral influence—not in the assumptions of theoretical prerogative, but in the supremacy of religious excellence and intellectual worth, which will, by the very laws of men's moral constitution, as surely secure to itself the homage which is its due, as the sun in the solar system evinces, by his own unrivalled splendour and diffusive effulgence, his unquestioned and unquestionable supremacy over the other planetary bodies of our material universe. But it involves the essence of despotism, tyranny and oppression, to claim and exercise a power upon the abstract ground of prerogative, irrespective of superior qualifications and virtues, which results from the natural order of things where those pre-eminent qualifications and virtues manifestly exist.

These remarks in no degree contravene the necessity and importance of different offices and authorities in the Church of Christ; but they do legitimately and properly apply to arbitrary and unnatural distinctions amongst labourers and ministers of the same order and vocation. If the Conference in England has not acquired, through its Representatives, that supremacy over the Church in Canada which was intended and anticipated by the London Missionary Secretaries, it has not been for want of an ample and most favourable opportunity. The members of the British Conference in Upper Canada have occupied, for several years, the most important and influential stations in the Canada Conference; they have been put forward and distinguished on all special occasions; they have been noticed in the annual addresses of the Conference from year to year in language of courtesy and praise, such as the members of the Canada Conference have never adopted in respect to each other. If, after all, the attachment of our congregations is strong and universal, with a few individual exceptions, to those Ministers who have been called out into the work in the country, and who, like their congregations, are emigrants from various parts of Great Britain and Ireland, as well as natives of the Province, who suffer with the poverty, and rise with the wealth, and are involved in the destinies, and partake in all the sympathies, of their congregations, we believe that the inheritance of respect and affection and influence thus obtained by our Ministers has been legitimately acquired, ought to be diligently and scripturally employed in the service of the Church, and cannot be sacrificed at the shrine of any distant prerogative, without unfaithfulness to their People and infidelity to their Providential trust.

For five years and upwards after the Union, the representatives and members of the British Conference in Upper Canada co-operated harmoniously and with apparent cordiality with the Conference in the Province, in reference to both ecclesiastical and civil affairs, and received every mark of affectionate respect and distinction which our Ministers and people could bestow upon them. During this period the Missionary Secretaries and other members of the British Conference entered decidedly and publicly into leading questions of civil polity agitated in the Mother Country, espousing the cause of the Church establishment against the Dissenters, and assuming an attitude of avowed hos-

tility against the Government on the question of Public Education. The Missionary Secretaries determined at length to exercise their assumed authority and influence (which they supposed by this time to be sufficiently established) in Upper Canada, in relation to these matters. Consequently, in February, 1839, they addressed a letter to the Lieutenant Governor of Upper Canada relative to the "*position of the Methodists of Upper Canada*" "as to certain ecclesiastical questions"—disclaiming all participation in the sentiments of Methodist publications in Upper Canada on these subjects—and informing His Excellency that they had appointed one of their number, Mr. Alder, to proceed to Canada and "exert his well-earned consideration and influence" with the Ministers and members of the Wesleyan Methodist Church, in order to enforce and carry out the views of the London Missionary Committee on these "ecclesiastical questions." Such a communication to the Head of the Government in Upper Canada was a bold and officious interference on the part of the Missionary Secretaries in London with matters in which the feelings and rights and interests of the inhabitants of Canada alone were concerned. The obvious intention and tendency of their communication was to impress upon the Government of Upper Canada, that the Missionary Secretaries and their Agents were alone to be consulted on the part of "the Methodists of Upper Canada" in the settlement of those "ecclesiastical questions"—thus striking a fatal blow at the rights and authority of the Conference in Canada as the Head and Representative of the Wesleyan Methodist Church in the Province. When published in Canada, this letter was universally reprobated both by Methodists and other classes of the community. The Lieutenant Governor, however, acted upon it, and, during the latter part of March and April, 1839, when the Clergy Reserve Question was under the consideration of the Provincial Legislature, His Excellency conferred exclusively with the Representatives of the Missionary Secretaries; their name and influence were employed amongst the members of the Legislature in opposition to the sentiments of the organ of the Canada Conference; and in a bill introduced into the Provincial Legislature it was provided that the portion of the proceeds of the Reserves professedly intended for the Wesleyan Methodist Church should be given to the "*Wesleyan Methodists in connexion with the BRITISH WESLEYAN CONFERENCE*"—not recognizing the *Conference in Canada*, leaving its very name as well as authority entirely out of the question. Our ministerial Brethren doubtless recollect that when their Secretary and Editor laid these circumstances before the Conference assembled at Hamilton in June, 1839, and stated the embarrassments which he had experienced in consequence of them in maintaining the views and rights of the Church during the preceding session of the Legislature, that his Brethren not only expressed their disapprobation of any such interference, but, at his suggestion, and in compliance with his wish, after they had re-appointed him their organ and representative for the ensuing year, they did,—*in order to prevent any such counter-representations, under any apparently official sanction, being made to the Government, and in order to secure the proper representation and guardianship of the views and rights of the Church in Canada,*—refer the Clergy Reserve Question especially to the Book Committee.

Within a few days of the date of the above mentioned letter to the Lieutenant Governor of Upper Canada, the Missionary Secretaries addressed a letter to their Representative in this Province, dated January 14, 1839, (1) condemning the views advocated in the Christian Guardian on the question of the Clergy Reserves; (2) objecting to the discussion of the Clergy Reserve Question at all in the Conference Journal; (3) directing their Representative to employ his influence with the Editor of the Guardian to carry out the views of the Missionary Secretaries—adding—“If you should fail in your attempt, then it will be for you to consider, whether you are not, as President of the Conference, empowered to interfere officially and authoritatively with the management of the Conference Journal, and to require, that, until the meeting of the next Conference, questions which ‘tend to strife rather than to godly edifying,’ shall be excluded from its pages.”

A few days before Mr. Alder left London on his late Mission to Upper Canada, the President of the British Conference addressed a letter to the Secretary of the Canada Conference on the subject and objects of Mr. Alder’s Mission. This letter is dated London, March 23, 1839, and contains the following statements and declarations: “Dear Sir—The advocacy in the Christian Guardian newspaper of the principles of strict and systematic dissent, in opposition to all religious establishments, has given deep and just offence to many of our best friends in England; and is regarded as a direct violation of the terms of Union between your Conference and our own. If the Guardian persist in the course which it has for some time pursued, the Union of the two Conferences can no longer be maintained.—The matter is deemed of such serious consequence, that Mr. Alder has been expressly appointed to visit Canada, for the purpose of obtaining a strict and faithful adherence to the stipulated conditions of Union between your Conference and our own; although his mission will occasion considerable expense, and his absence from England be very injurious to the interests of our Missions. The consequences of an open rupture between the two Conferences, especially in the present state of the Colony, and of your own Indian Missions, I trust you will seriously weigh, and not persist in a course which has occasioned loud and just complaints. I am,” &c. (Signed) “THOMAS JACKSON.”

Here several things are to be observed. (1.) This was the first interference of the London Missionary Committee with the question of the Clergy Reserves or Church Establishment in Upper Canada; although the question had been formally discussed in the columns of the Conference Journal both before and after the Union down to 1839. (2.) The discussion of the question is here stated, for the first time, to be “a direct violation of the terms of the Union” between the English and Canada Conferences; although the Representative of the Canada Conference in his Report of his Mission to England in 1833, on the subject of the Union, stated the reverse—stated that the co-operation and influence of the Committee in London would be exerted to maintain the expressed views and equal rights of the Wesleyan Methodist Church in Canada on the question of the Clergy Reserves; and of the two Representatives of the British Conference (Messrs. Marsden and Stinson) concurred in the correctness of that Report when it was read in our Conference, assembled

in Toronto, October, 1833, when all the circumstances to which it referred were fresh in their recollection; and although the Representatives of the British Conference in Canada had co-operated with our Conference in resolutions and addresses upon, and the advocacy of the Clergy Reserve Question during the entire period from 1833 to 1839. (3.) Though the Canada Conference had reserved its full right to act according to its own judgment and discretion on the question of a Church establishment in Canada, as admitted and concurred in by the Representatives of the British Conference from 1833 to 1839; yet, for the sake of peace, and out of respect for the British Conference, the abstract principle of religious Establishments had not been interfered with, but had even been admitted on the part of our Conference and by its official organ, which had gone so far as to say, and to repeat at different times—"We have not a word to say on the expediency and wisdom of the Ecclesiastical Establishment of England; nor on the subject of Imperial Parliamentary appropriations in aid of Colonial Clergy. We are not an advocate for the subversion of the English National Church Establishment, interwoven as it is by the operations of a thousand years with the entire civil and social institutions of England, however opposed we may be, upon the most weighty considerations, to its introduction into a new and differently constituted state of society." "Nor have we any thing to say in objection to the right or propriety of any people or country legislating for the encouragement of a particular form of religion when the great majority of them are agreed in its belief and profession, and in the expediency of adopting such a method to inculcate it. We do not feel it necessary to express an opinion on either of these points; but we concede them in the present discussion." Adding again—"All civil laws and legislation ought to be based on the Christian Religion; we believe that civil legislation will be amongst the trophies of Christian triumph—that the collective homage of nations will be the inheritance of the Son of God, as well as the love and obedience of individuals." Indeed, our large concessions on this subject have given offence to many sincere and esteemed friends of our Church in Canada; and so narrow, and entirely local and practical was the ground we occupied on this subject, that we consented to an equitable division of the *interest* of the proceeds of the sales of the Clergy Reserves amongst the different Christian denominations recognized by the laws of Upper Canada; only insisting that that division should be upon terms equally accessible to them—that while some churches could apply the proportion allotted to them for the support of their Clergy, others should have equal liberty to apply their proportion to the building of *chapels* and *parsonages* and the *christian education of their youth*. (4.) But even under such circumstances, and after the acknowledged reservation of the Clergy Reserve Question to the discretionary consideration and action of our Conference, did the Wesleyan Missionary Secretaries in London commence an interference with the question, and deputed Mr. Alder on a Church Establishment Mission to Upper Canada. (5.) And let it be observed lastly, that the entire ground of avowed objection and interference related, not to any secular matter, but to the question of a Church Establishment in Upper Canada, and that this was the ground and

solely avowed object of Mr. Alder's Mission to this Province in respect to the proceedings of our Conference and its official organ.

But on Mr. Alder's arrival in Upper Canada, he found the views and feelings of our Conference—of the Members of our Church, whether emigrants from Great Britain and Ireland or natives of the country—indeed of the inhabitants generally—so strong and almost unanimous against the letter and interference of the Missionary Secretaries and his own published communications,* that he deemed it expedient at our Conference assembled at Hamilton in June 1839, to avoid the introduction of the primary and real object of his mission, and directed his objections chiefly to the then recently expressed views of the Editor of the *Guardian* respecting Lord Durham and his Report—a Report which did not reach Canada until *six days after* Mr. Alder sailed from England; and which could not therefore by any possibility have formed any part of his appointed Mission. Our brethren in the Ministry will recollect that the Secretary had to read the official letters above referred to, in order to put the Conference in possession of the real objects of Mr. Alder's Mission; and not only did the Conference maintain its position and rights on the question of the Clergy Reserves; but such were the facts elicited by the discussion, that Mr. Alder did not even request the Conference to rescind several resolutions which it had unanimously adopted on that subject in 1837; (of which resolutions, however, the late British Conference state, in its proceedings, it strongly disapproves;) and even at length assented to a resolution in which our Conference reiterated its previously expressed sentiments on the question of a Church Establishment in Canada, and our constitutional rights, and our determination to maintain them.

It became perfectly evident that the Missionary Secretaries in London could not acquire the absolute ascendancy over the affairs of Methodism in Upper

* *Note by E. Ryerson.*—It is worthy of remark that the *Old Country* part of the Members of our Church were the most forward and ardent in the expression of their views and feelings on this subject. The Editor of the *Guardian* received communications from *Hamilton, Guelph, Toronto (Township) Circuit, Yonge Street, Bytown, &c.*, condemning the interference of the London Missionary Secretaries, and strongly approving of the course which he had pursued. In these places the official members of our church were almost entirely emigrants from Great Britain and Ireland. This was especially the case in regard to *Hamilton, Guelph, and Bytown*, where the official members were unanimous and strong in the expression of their sentiments on the occasion. Motives of delicacy induced the Editor to withhold those communications from the readers of the *Guardian*, though they are still in his possession, and he still retains a grateful recollection of the principles and feelings which dictated them. Natives of Great Britain and Ireland, as well as natives of Canada, with very few exceptions, know how to appreciate their rights and privileges on the Western, as well as on the Eastern side of the Atlantic, and prefer guarding their own rights and managing their own affairs to leaving them to be disposed of by the Missionary Secretaries in London. Their interests, themselves and posterity, are located in *Canada*, not in *London*; and the place of *residence* is the most appropriate place of *management*; and in our Conference, the President, Secretary, Editor, Book-Steward, and all the principal Committees, are elected annually by ballot, by the suffrages of all the Members of the Conference. Hundreds of Emigrants have been sought in the wilderness and gathered into the Church, and supplied with the ordinances of the Sanctuary; and some have been raised up to be Ministers of the Word.

Canada which they had contemplated and claimed, without adopting other means than those which they had hitherto employed. It was also clear, from the state of feeling throughout our Connexion, that the breaking up of the Union at that time would effectually defeat their own objects. Claiming the Missions in Upper Canada as their exclusive property, and assuming the right to send *what* Missionaries, and station them *when* and *where* they pleased,—making the line of distinction between the *Missionary* and *regular Circuit work* as marked as possible—and securing to the British Conference a control over the disposal of the Methodist portion of the Clergy Reserves, in the event of a division of them—seems to have been considered a co-ordinate and now the only means of weakening and ultimately overpowering the distinctive influence and energies of the Canada Connexion on the one hand, and of attaining the earnestly desired supremacy of the London Committee on the other. Hence, as the members of our Conference will remember, the claims which Mr. Alder made to the entire property in our Missions, and his most strenuous efforts to procure the erasure of a certain note in our Discipline, and to get the assent of our Conference, in some form or another, to the right of the London Missionary Committee to send Missionaries at their discretion into any part of Upper Canada; also his reluctance and peculiar remarks at the appointment of a Committee to guard our rights on the Clergy Reserves—the appointment of which Committee, in his statements at the late English Conference, Mr. Alder termed “an innovation.” It is clear, that the Lieutenant Governor had been induced and was determined to employ his influence to have whatever part of the proceeds of the Reserves the Wesleyan Methodist Church in Canada might be entitled to, on the settlement of that question, placed at the disposal of the British Wesleyan Conference; and we have been informed from private sources,—but have no official authority for the statement—that it was understood between Mr. Alder and the Lieutenant Governor, that, in adjusting the titles of Indian Lands, the Mission premises at the various stations should be secured to the Wesleyan Missionary Committee in London, independent of the Canada Conference, notwithstanding the establishment of all those Missions, but one, by our Conference.

At this critical juncture of our affairs, and of the affairs of the Province, by the good providence of God, the Governor General assumed the Government of Upper Canada. It has come to our knowledge, (but not from any person connected with the Government) that the Governor General was advised from high quarters to confer with the Agent of the London Missionary Committee on the question of the Clergy Reserves, and by no means to consult Mr. E. Ryerson—the appointed representative of the Canada Conference; but His Excellency, with that discernment and sense of justice which becomes a wise and impartial Governor of a country, determined to hear all parties and then judge for himself. Accordingly, he sent for Messrs. Stinson and Richey on the part of the London Missionary Committee, and for Mr. E. Ryerson on the part of the Canada Conference. The differing views of the parties on some points, and the important interests involved, induced His Excellency to investigate the relations of the English and Canada Connexions, and all the circumstances connected with the Grant to the Wesleyan Missionary Committee out

of the Casual and Territorial Revenue—knowing something personally respecting the design and objects of the original Grant itself, as he was a Member of His late Majesty's Government in 1832, when the Grant was made. The conclusions of His Excellency were in character with the just and noble feeling which dictated his inquiries. They have already called forth the grateful acknowledgments of our Conference, and secured the affectionate esteem of the members and friends of our Church generally, as far as they have been understood, and will do so to a still greater extent as they will now be more widely and more fully made known.

One of the two letters addressed by Mr. E. Ryerson to the Governor General on the subject of the financial relations of the Conferences in England and Canada, was transmitted by His Excellency to the Secretary of State for the Colonies, in illustration of views stated at large in an accompanying despatch of his own. The circumstances under which that letter was written not being known to the Secretary of State for the Colonies, a copy of it was sent to the Missionary Secretaries. A favourable opportunity seemed now to present itself for them to put down the individual member of the Canada Conference who had in the fulfilment of his official relations and duties, opposed the principal obstacles to their views of political and ecclesiastical power in Canada, and also for them to put forth those assumptions of power which they had hitherto attempted in vain to secure. Hence, instead of transmitting a copy of that letter to our Conference for investigation, and for explanation or condemnation, as the case might require, a few London Members of a Special Committee were called together, who adopted a series of Resolutions, containing assumptions of prerogative and power, accusations, and sentences of condemnation against the author of that letter, and calling upon our Conference to carry them into execution on pain of a dissolution of the Union. Our Conference entered into a careful and thorough investigation of the whole matter; and whilst it maintained, in the most inoffensive and respectful language, its own rights and privileges, it more than disclaimed the slightest imputation upon the motives of the London Committee; and concluded its proceedings on the subject by appointing two of its own Members to proceed to England, to explain the whole matter, and to do all in their power to maintain the Articles of the Union inviolate.

The circumstances which we have thus narrated are, for the most part, familiar to the members of the Conference; but we have deemed this brief sketch of them essential to a correct understanding of the whole case by our brethren and friends generally throughout the Province.

We received our appointment as Representatives of the Conference, by the ballot votes of our Brethren, on the 20th of June; and on the 1st of July we embarked at New York for Liverpool, where we arrived after a pleasant passage of 21 days. We entered upon our mission deeply sensible of the difficulties and responsibilities involved in it; but with a full determination, in humble dependence upon Divine aid and blessing, to represent most truly the views and feelings of our constituents—to concede, if necessary for the sake of peace, any thing except what was essential to their rights and interests—and to use our best endeavours to preserve inviolate the articles of the Union between the

two Connexions. On the same day that we embarked on board of a packet ship for Liverpool, Messrs. Stinson and Richey embarked on board of the "Great Western" for London, where they arrived eight days before us. On our arrival in London, we found that an impression and feeling derogatory and unfriendly to the Canada Conference had been widely diffused; and, on our arrival at Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Thursday the 30th of July, we found the same impression and feeling prevalent amongst the members of the English Conference.

We learnt, on arriving in England, that the Bill for the sale of the Clergy Reserves of Upper Canada and the appropriation of the proceeds thereof was still before Parliament, and that Lord John Russell, in deference to the Bishops in the House of Lords, had admitted amendments into that Bill which rendered it materially different in its character and provisions from what it was when his Lordship brought it into the House of Commons. We had an interview with his Lordship on the subject of the Bill; stated verbally, and afterwards in writing, various objections to the *amended* or *altered* Bill. We also applied to and obtained from his Lordship a copy of a very long letter which, as we had been informed, Mr. Alder had addressed to his Lordship in April last on the subject of the Government Grant to the Missionary Committee out of the Casual and Territorial Revenue, and the financial relations of the English and Canada Conferences. Mr. Alder's letter purported to be a reply to the letter of Mr. E. Ryerson to the Governor General, dated 17th January last, and contained many incorrect statements, and some unbecoming reflections both upon the American Connexion in the United States and the Conference of the Wesleyan Methodist Church in Canada. We improved the earliest opportunity to lay before Lord John Russell a full reply to Mr. Alder's letter. Both Mr. Alder's letter and our reply will be found amongst the documents accompanying this Report.

On arriving at Newcastle-upon-Tyne, we went to the chapel in which the Conference was assembled, and sent in a card with our names. Mr. Marsden came out and received us kindly. We were then directed to a boarding-house, where we lodged during our stay in Newcastle. The morning after our arrival, we received a card of admittance into the Conference Chapel. The afternoon of the same day, we addressed a note, of which the following is a copy, to the President of the Conference:

"Conference Room, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, July 31st, 1840.

REV. SIR,—The undersigned having been appointed by the Conference of the Wesleyan Methodist Church in Canada as its Representatives to the British Wesleyan Conference, arrived here yesterday on the objects of their mission. They informed the Rev. Mr. Marsden, and since the Superintendent of this Circuit, of their arrival; and supposed that a more formal notice would not be necessary until they should have an opportunity of presenting to you and to the Conference the Address and Resolutions of the Canada Conference which state their appointment and specify the objects of it.

We beg to inform you that we are prepared, at your convenience, to lay before the Conference the documents to which we have above referred.

We are, Rev. Sir, your very obedient humble servants,

The Rev. R. NEWTON,
President of the Conference.

W. RYERSON,
E. RYERSON.

In answer to the foregoing note, the President of the Conference returned a verbal message—"presenting his compliments to the Messrs. Ryerson—acknowledging the receipt of their note—stating that as soon as convenient he would give way for the reading of their documents, when a Committee would be appointed to take them into consideration. In the mean time he hoped they were comfortably situated."

During the same evening, as we afterwards learnt, the Committee which had been appointed at the Conference of 1839 met. It appeared, that the resolutions which had been adopted in London, April 29, 1840, and sent out to Canada, and which gave rise to our mission to England, had been adopted only by those members of that Committee who resided in London,—there being no time, as it was stated, to give notice to the "country members," who were now called together with their London brethren to hear resolutions which had been adopted by the few in London in April last. Those resolutions were now read to the whole Committee and re-affirmed. The following day this Committee reported to the Conference in a few words—stating that they had met the previous evening and re-affirmed the resolutions which had been adopted by the London members of the Committee the 29th of April last on Canadian affairs, and recommending the Conference to appoint and refer the whole affair to a larger Committee.

On Saturday afternoon, the 1st of August, our names were mentioned to the Conference by the President as the Representatives of the Canada Conference; and we were invited—not to take our seats on the platform, (a courtesy invariably extended hitherto to the Representatives of other Conferences throughout the Methodist world,) where the Representatives of the American and Irish Conferences had always been invited to sit—where the Representatives of the Irish Conference were then sitting—where the Representative of the Canada Conference had sat on two former occasions—but we were invited to take our seats in the body of the chapel—receiving intimation thereby, as well as from various other circumstances, that the Canada Conference must not presume to consider itself of equal standing with other Conferences of Methodism, especially with the Conference in England.

On this introduction to the Conference, we presented to the President the Address and Resolutions of the Conference we represented; but they were not read in Conference until *thirteen days afterwards*.

During the subsequent days we urged, by notes to the President, and in conversation with such leading members of the Conference as we had access to, the early consideration of the Canadian business; but it was not until Thursday afternoon, the 6th of August, just before the adjournment, that any movement was made in it. It was then proposed to appoint a large Committee to investigate the whole matter and report thereon. To this mode of proceeding we objected in the present stage of the business. (1.) Because neither the Resolutions nor Address of the Canada Conference had been read; and we knew of no example of referring documents of that nature to a Committee before they had been read by the Body to whom they were addressed. (2.) We stood before them in behalf of the Canada Conference, as *Appellants* or *Complainants* against the encroachments and proceedings of a Committee of

that Conference; and it was at variance with Methodist usage when, even an individual member of the Conference, complained or appealed against the proceedings of a District Meeting, or any Conference Committee, to refer him back to the same Meeting or Committee, perhaps with the addition of a few other members—that, in judicial proceedings, it was never known that an appeal from the decision of a Judge of the Assizes was referred by the Judges of the Queen's Bench to the same Judge whose decision had been appealed from. (3.) We were representatives of the Canada Conference to that Conference, and not to a Committee; and we desired to lay the whole matter before the Members of the Conference at large, from a full conviction that when they were made acquainted with all the facts of the case, they would not justify the proceedings of the London Committee, but would coincide with the Canada Conference.

But Dr. Bunting contended, on the contrary, that *they* were the *complainants* and we were the *defendants*, and that proceeding by Committee was the only proper mode of considering and disposing of the business.

There was, however, a strong and general feeling amongst the Preachers to have the case investigated in Conference; and the President at length assured them and us, that a full opportunity should be given of stating and hearing the whole case in Conference. We replied, that with that assurance and understanding we had no objection to go before a Committee.

A large Committee was then appointed, consisting of the Members of the Canada Committee of the previous year with about as many more additional Members.

The first meeting of the Committee did not take place until Saturday the 8th of August; when Mr. Alder appeared on behalf of the London Committee, and made a very lengthened statement, giving a history (in part) of the origin and design and progress of the Union from 1832 to the present time; introducing his above-mentioned voluminous letter (which was read) to Lord John Russell. Mr. Alder was followed in continuation and confirmation by Mr. Stinson; after which we were called upon to reply. At almost every stage of our reply, we were met by objections, explanations and rejoinders, which very greatly protracted the discussion, and put it out of our power to do justice to some of the points at issue. It is unnecessary for us to state the order or features of the discussions which ensued during three ensuing evenings. On Thursday evening the 13th of August, the Committee made a report to the Conference. The Report was read, but was not taken into consideration that evening on account of the lateness of the hour. We requested a copy and then the perusal of the Report, but were not allowed either.

The Conference having now been in Session upwards of a fortnight, more than *three-fourths* of the Members had left for their Circuits; so that there were less than eighty present during the consideration of the subject of our Mission. Consequently more than three-fourths of the Members of the English Conference are ignorant to this day of the nature of the articles of Union (as they have never been printed in England) and of all the circumstances which have transpired between the two Connexions.

When the Report was taken up next day, Friday the 14th of August, the

last day of the Session, we adverted to the inconvenience we experienced in speaking to the Report of the Committee, as we had not been favoured with a copy or with the perusal of it. It was then frankly admitted, that we had a right to a copy of the Report and time to examine it before we were called upon to express our views respecting it.

Having obtained a copy of the Report as first presented by the Committee, we retired and examined it. That Report (which we afterwards returned by request,) did not contain such an enumeration of statements and synopsis of certain documents as are contained in the published Report of the Committee; but the leading sentiments of the Report in both stages and forms are the same. That Report, which, together with the decision of the English Conference, will be found amongst the documents appended to this Report, contained, amongst other things,—

1. A repetition and confirmation of the allegations, and assumptions of power, and decisions, which had been embodied in the Resolutions of the London Committee, dated April 29, 1840; and also a vote of thanks to that Committee.

2. A declaration against any interference on the part of the "Christian Guardian" with "party political reasonings and discussions."

3. The admission and *maintenance* by the Christian Guardian of "the duty of civil Governments to employ their influence, and a portion of their resources, for the support of the Christian religion."

4. The *advocacy* by Mr. E. Ryerson, and "by the Upper Canada brethren," of the right of the London Missionary Committee to the Government Grant, "even if its payment should be transferred to the Clergy Reserve Fund."

5. A vote of "hearty esteem and approbation" to Messrs. Stinson and Richey for "the ability, fidelity, and diligence" with which they had "performed the duties officially confided to them."

6. A declaration that the English Conference could not be identified "with any Body, however respected, *over whose public proceedings* it is denied the right and power of exerting any official influence, so as to *secure a reasonable and necessary* co-ordinate but EFFICIENT DIRECTION, during the continuance of the Union:" (of the nature and extent of which "efficient direction" the English Conference was, of course, to be the Judge.)

7. A recommendation that "the Conference now remit the whole affair to the management of a Special Committee, whose duty it shall be to draw up a statement, in a more detailed manner, of the points on which full satisfaction will be expected from the Conference of Upper Canada, and to make such a report of the Resolutions of that body thereupon, as may enable our next Conference, assembling in Manchester, (in 1841,) to determine, finally, the course which, in reference to this Union, it *may then* be proper to adopt in the settlement of the whole affair."

Such were the leading sentiments and positions of the Report, from the beginning to the end of which there was not the slightest inclination expressed to aid the institutions or interests of the Wesleyan Methodist Church in Canada in any way whatever—but only a wish to rule over it, to employ its name and influence to obtain the patronage of Government, and to use it for the advance-

ment of the views and plans of the Agents of the Missionary Secretaries of the English Conference. Indeed, throughout the whole of the proceedings, the idea did not appear to be admitted by a single member of the London Committee, that any Canadian Preacher should stand upon similar footing with the Members of the English Conference.

To the above positions and requirements of the Committee we replied, in substance, as follows :*

1. With respect to the allegations, and assumptions, and proceedings of the London Committee, dated 29th April last, our Conference had expressed all the views we had to state. The Resolutions of our Conference, which had been adopted with unusual unanimity, after the most mature deliberation, we had no authority to annul or modify. Nor did we see any reason to desire to do so, as we believed they were just, and expressed views and feelings by which our Brethren would abide.

2. With respect to the *Christian Guardian*, we were prepared, as we had been from the beginning, to go with them all lengths in making it a strictly religious and literary Journal—such it had already been made by its conductor and by order of the Conference; and the exigencies which had given rise to its departure, on some occasions, from strict neutrality in certain questions of civil polity, existed no longer.†

3. As to *advocating the duty of civil Governments to support Religion*,—the views of our Conference and People on that subject had been adopted and avowed long before the *Union*—were explicitly stated at the time of the *Union*—had been officially expressed and advocated for years since the *Union*, and with the concurrence of their own Representatives, and without the slightest

* *Note*.—We would not wish to convey the idea, that we employed in the Conference the identical words which are used in the following paragraphs; or that our remarks were made in the order in which they are here inserted; or that they were all made in that connexion. We spoke after a few moments' examination of the Report of the Committee. On some points we expatiated at considerable length; on other points we referred to what we had stated in the course of previous discussions. The following paragraphs, therefore, contain a mere summary or brief outline of what we stated during the investigation of the affair, on the several points referred to.

† *Note by E. R.*—Had the Agents of the London Missionary Committee represented to the local Government the views and feelings of the Conference and Members of the Wesleyan Methodist Church in Canada, instead of the opposite views and feelings of the Missionary Secretaries in London, there is reason to believe that the late Executive would not have been prompted and encouraged to pursue the policy which rendered so strong a discussion of some points necessary in the columns of the *Guardian*. While the Executive looked to the Agents of the London Committee, and not to the *Guardian*, as the interpreter of the rights, and interests, and views of the Wesleyan Body in Canada, it pursued a partial and unjust course of policy. The Governor General satisfied himself that the Editor of the *Guardian*, and not the Agents of the London Committee, was the true Representative of the interests and sentiments of our Church. His Excellency has therefore acquired the confidence and support of our People generally, though he has been denounced by the Agents of the London Committee. The *Guardian* has ceased from the discussion of any political questions; and the adherents of the London Missionary Secretaries cherish, in our judgment, stronger political party feelings than any other portion of the Methodist community in Canada.

objection on their part before 1839 ; that we had no inclination to oppose that principle, nor had we done so ; but we could not regard the principle itself, much less the *advocacy* of it, as any part of *Wesleyan Methodism*, however it might have been adopted by the British Conference, as it was not contained in Mr. Wesley's Four Volumes of Sermons or Notes on the New Testament ; that we fully agreed with Mr. Wesley that a Church Establishment was a *human* institution, (and not of Divine appointment,) and therefore liable to the modifications and contingencies of all other human institutions, which might be suitable in some cases but not in others ; that we saw no occasion at the present time in Upper Canada to discuss the question at all on either side ; that we thought the attention and feelings of our People might now be directed to more profitable subjects ; and that we could not assent to such a proposition, which formed an entirely new and very remarkable Article of Union.

4. In regard to the *Government Grant*—they had alleged a *fact*, that the Secretary of the Canada Conference had applied for that Grant in behalf of his Conference. We had answered to that *alleged fact*, and proved, by the testimony of the Governor General himself, that the Secretary of the Canada Conference had made no such application. Further than this we could not be reasonably required, nor were we prepared, to go ; that we, as well as they, had undoubtedly a right to our *opinions* on the subject ; and we were not prepared to array ourselves in opposition to the views of the Governor General on the subject ; that when it came, not to a matter of *fact*, but a matter of *opinion*, we fully concurred in the opinions of the Governor General, as did our Conference ; and we felt the more grateful to His Excellency, and the more fully satisfied of the correctness of his views, because they had been adopted without any influence from without,—because he was personally knowing to the intentions of Government in making that Grant,—was confessedly competent to investigate all the circumstances connected with it, and was unquestionably a disinterested Judge. With His Excellency the Governor-General of Canada, we objected to their having claim to any portion of the *Clergy Reserve Fund*. All the claims which Methodism had acquired to a participation in that Fund, had been acquired by our exertions—that they had opposed our advocacy on that question, and their Representatives had expressed their belief that that fund was intended for the Church of England alone, and that they had no objection to its enjoyment of the whole of that Fund ; it was therefore most unreasonable, now that our views had prevailed and their views had been set aside, that they should come forward even as *first* claimants upon that very Fund, and insist upon our advocating *THEIR* claims as a condition of continuing the Union. We adverted to the fact, that they had large pecuniary resources for the support of their Institutions in England—that they had large funds for the education of their children ; whilst the brethren in Canada, who had endured toils and privations such as no Preachers in England of the present day had endured, had no such means at their disposal in that new country. We likewise mentioned the circumstance, that the Clergy Reserve Fund was a *provincial* revenue, and intended to aid the funds of Christian denominations in Upper Canada, and not the funds of Christian denominations in England ; that this was the case with each of the Churches

in Upper Canada who received a portion of the proceeds of the Clergy Reserves, with the exception of the Church of England; in respect to which the Propagation Society had assumed the responsibility of supporting the Episcopal Clergy in that Province; that if the Wesleyan Conference in England would assume the same responsibility in regard to the support of the Ministers of our Church in Upper Canada that the Propagation Society sustained in regard to the support of the Episcopal Clergy, we would very readily give our consent and support to their claims upon the Clergy Reserve Fund.

5. In regard to Messrs. Stinson and Richey, such was the course of proceeding which they had thought proper to pursue, that we should feel it our duty to make a statement of it for the information of our brethren, many of whom would feel not a little astonished and grieved to learn, that notwithstanding the marked attentions which had been paid to them by their brethren both in the ministry and amongst the laity of our church in Canada, Messrs. Stinson and Richey had been, during the last two years, writing letters to London of a disparaging and calumnious character against their fellow labourers in Canada; that Mr. Stinson had stated in a letter dated as late as the 20th of last March that it was a "degradation" for the Committee in London to continue a union with "such men;" that Mr. Richey had stated that, during his four years' residence in Upper Canada, he had been "treated as a *stranger*, a *foreigner*, and an *alien*;" and that during this whole proceeding both Messrs. Stinson and Richey had done every thing in their power against the Canada Conference.

6. Respecting the general and undefined claim of "efficient direction" over the "public proceedings" of the Canada Conference, it should be observed—(1) That the articles of union already gave them very great power—every thing indeed that we conceived could be reasonably desired; (2) That if they demanded an "efficient direction" over the "public proceedings" of the Canada Conference generally, they ought to assume the responsibility of supporting the institutions generally of the Wesleyan Methodist Church in Canada. How could a father be responsible for the support even of his own children, if he were not the master of his own talents and energies and resources—if he were the property, as to "efficient direction," of another? The proprietor was, of course, the properly responsible person for the support of both the slave and his children. How could they therefore insist upon "an efficient direction over the public proceedings" of the Canada Conference, and yet actually maintain at the same time, as a written article of agreement, that the Canada Conference should have "no claim upon the funds of the English Conference?" If the Canada Connexion was responsible, and entirely depending upon its own "proceedings" for the support of its own institutions, it must be the judge and director of those proceedings. The contrary principle is an absurdity in all the civil and religious and social relations of life. Not even a father claims an "efficient direction" over the proceedings of his children when

* Note by E. R.—The Editor of the Guardian and his friends supported, at this eventful crisis, the administration of the Governor General; this Mr. Stinson represents as a "degradation."

they are thrown upon their own resources for their own support; much less ought one community to claim such a direction over another self-sustained and self-supported community on an opposite side of the Atlantic.

7. And even upon these terms they did not *propose a permanent continuation* of the Union, but only until the next Conference to be assembled in Manchester, July, 1841, when they would "determine finally the course which, *in reference to this Union, it may then be proper to adopt* in the settlement of the whole affair"—thus insisting upon the use of the name and influence and advocacy of "the Upper Canada Brethren" in order to secure the claims of the Committee in London upon the patronage and support of the Government; requiring the Canada Conference to divest itself of the attributes essential to any Body responsible for its own proceedings and the support of its own members and institutions, and even calling upon the Canada Conference "to *admit and MAINTAIN,*" in its official organ, the principle that it is the "*duty of civil governments to apply a portion of their resources for the support of the Christian religion;*" and after all, by a solemn act of their Conference, making the Union a question of agitation and electioneering for twelve months to come; at the end of which they would decide whether their own purposes could be best promoted by continuing or discontinuing the Union!

Moreover, we stated to the Committee at different times, and adverted to it more particularly in our concluding observations to the Conference, that the whole of their views and proceedings seemed to be founded upon the supposition and assumption, that the Brethren in Canada were but mere children, comparatively ignorant of the principles of Wesleyan Methodism, incompetent and unfit to judge and act for themselves; whereas, the Connexion in that Province, in relation to the Ministry or Laity, ought not to be treated as mere children. For, (1) in no part of the world, did we think the Ecclesiastical polity of Methodism was so well understood by the members of the Church generally as in Upper Canada; the reason of which was obvious from the facts, that, in addition to the ordinary means and inducements for information on the various branches of that great system, a vigorous attempt was made in 1828 to introduce lay delegation and other essential changes in the economy of Methodism in that Province, which led to an elaborate discussion of all its essential and distinctive principles, and resulted in its more permanent establishment in its purity and integrity. In 1833-4, in consequence of the Union, every part of the polity of Methodism underwent a second rigid scrutiny and thorough discussion. Subsequently, in 1836-7, in consequence of legal proceedings affecting our title to chapel property which had been instituted against us, our whole polity in relation to the civil law, the powers of the Conference, &c., was elaborately and fully discussed by the Judges of the land, and several public writers. During the last twelve years, therefore, Upper Canada has been a sort of manual labour school for the study of Methodist Church polity; and the leading features of it were as familiar as household words to the members of our church generally. They ought not to be regarded, therefore, as untutored children. (2) Whilst we admitted many advantages in England for the improvement of the Ministry which we did not possess in Canada, we must say that our examinations of candidates for the ministry were

already more extensive and thorough than theirs. Their examinations were wholly confined to *Divinity*—did not even embrace the *Evidences of Christianity*—a circumstance which had been regretted by several members of the British Conference in their remarks a day or two before; while, on the contrary, the examinations of candidates for the ministry under the direction of our Conference were quite as extensive and as minute as their even on the various doctrines in Divinity; in addition to which, a general course of study, with the proper books, was prescribed to them during their four years of probation; and they were examined on the *Evidences of Christianity, Moral Philosophy, Mental Philosophy, Natural Theology, Logic, Rhetoric, Ancient and Modern History, Ecclesiastical History, and Wesleyan Church Polity*, including the pretensions to the Divine Episcopal Succession, the authority and functions of the Ministry, the Administration and Rules of the Discipline.

At this point the President interposed, intimating that he thought these observations did not relate to the subject before the Conference, and could not be admitted at that advanced hour after so much time had been occupied in the investigation of this affair.

It was then observed on our part, in conclusion, that we considered the adoption of that Report by the Conference as equivalent to a relinquishment of the Articles of Union, which it was our duty and object to maintain inviolate; that while we had felt disposed, and again and again expressed a willingness, to concede any thing that was not unjust to our constituents and our country, and to consult in the most amicable and liberal spirit for the promotion of the great objects and interests of religion there by the agency of Methodism, we could not, on the part of the Conference we represented, nor did we believe the Canada Conference ever would, accede to the demands and new conditions embodied in the Report of their Committee.

We were then requested to retire; but at that juncture the Rev. DR. BEAUMONT rose, to move a dissolution of the Union, observing—"there is just as much reason in the Canada Conference sending Presidents to us as for us to send Presidents to them; and they are just as competent to manage their own affairs, as we are to manage our affairs." The Rev. DR. BUNTING said he thought so too—that he respected the Canada Conference; and what had just been stated (respecting the acquaintance of the Methodists in Upper Canada with their Church polity and the examinations of Candidates for the Ministry) confirmed him (Dr. B.) in the opinion which he had long entertained, that the Union had been wrong from the beginning. He (Dr. B.) believed it had been a great evil to the Canada Conference, and no good to the British Conference. It was in his (Dr. B.'s) opinion a well-intended, but an ill-advised measure.

We then retired; and were informed in the course of the evening, that quite a majority of the Conference had voted against that clause of the Report which recommended the continuation of the Union, but had adopted with one or two verbal alterations, the other parts of the Report. We were informed, indeed, that 13 to 17 of the *Committee* voted against the adoption of that clause of the Report. It is however, deserving of remark, that at Manchester, 1833, upwards of *three hundred* Preachers adopted the Articles of Union by a *unanimous* vote; but that at Newcastle-upon-Tyne, 1840, those Articles

were relinquished on the part of the British Conference by the vote of a *majority of seventy two Preachers.*

The following morning, August 15. we left Newcastle-upon-Tyne for London; and *ten days* afterwards, 25th of August, we received an official copy of the Report of the Committee and of the proceedings of the Conference.

During the early part of the proceedings of the Committee of the British Conference, we intimated our intention, should they proceed to relinquish the Union, to publish in England as well as in Canada, the official proceedings of both Conferences and a full statement of the case. Subsequently, however, we abandoned that intention, and concluded to return to Canada with all convenient despatch; but on examining the Report of the Proceedings of the British Conference on the subject of our Mission, we found it to be, in our judgment, so defective and partial in its statements, and calculated to convey so erroneous an impression in regard to the whole affair, that we felt we should do injustice to our Church and to ourselves not to publish in London, as well as in Canada, the whole of the official proceedings and correspondence relative to the Union and the recent events which have grown out of it. During four days of our last week's stay in London we prepared in a letter to the Rev. Dr. Hannah, Secretary of the British Conference, a full reply to its reported proceedings, and got a pamphlet of 120 pages passed through the press, entitled, "*WESLEYAN METHODIST CONFERENCE: its Union with the Conference of the Wesleyan Methodist Church in Canada in August 1833, and its separation from the Canada Conference in August 1840: consisting of the Official Proceedings and Correspondence of both Bodies and their Representatives. By W. & E. RYERSON, Representatives of the Canada Conference. Published in consequence of the Publication of the Proceedings of the English Conference in the printed Minutes.*"

We refer to our letter to Dr. Hannah for a more full discussion of the proceedings of the English Conference, and of the nature and merits of its assumptions over the Wesleyan Methodist Church in Canada. We will therefore conclude this Report with a few general remarks.

1. While communications have from time to time been transmitted to England during the last two years and upwards, by Members of the British Conference, derogatory to the character of their Brethren in Canada who had cordially received them amongst them, and who supposed they were acting in mutual good faith and confidence; and while the Missionary Secretaries in London have thought proper to employ these clandestine and heretofore unsuspected communications to justify their own aggressions upon the expressly reserved rights and privileges and interests of the Canada Conference, and the governing portion of the English Conference have sanctioned such a course of proceeding, and have acted upon these representations and embodied the substance of some of them in its own Resolutions, it is a matter of thankfulness to Almighty God, honorable to our Church, and calculated to afford satisfaction in the review that up to the moment of the relinquishment of its connexional relations with the Canada Conference, not a line, in any shape or form, could be produced from the publication or pen of any member of our Conference derogatory to the character of the British Conference or of individual members of it. On

all occasions, and throughout the whole period of our connexional Union with the English Conference, our language has been respectful and affectionate.

2. It ought not to be supposed that all those Members of the English Conference who advocated the abrogation of the Articles of the Union on their part, were influenced by unfriendly feelings towards the connexion in Canada, or were actuated by those notions of prerogative and power which have characterised the communications and proceedings of the Missionary Secretaries in London. On the contrary, we have the best reason to believe that many even of that portion of the British Conference were actuated more by a regard to the efficient operations and best interests of the Wesleyan Methodist Church in Canada than to the pretensions set up in London—believing that such claims of authority over, and such perpetual intermeddling with our affairs, without any personal or adequate knowledge of them, without any identification of interest with us, without any residence in this country, or any personal liability to the consequences of such intermeddling, must be injurious to our peace and harmony, enfeebling to our energies, and unfavourable to the prosperity of our Church, to an amount far overbalancing any advantages which could be rationally supposed to arise from our nominal connexion with the English Conference. We are satisfied that the great majority of the Members of the Conference in England sincerely desire the peace and prosperity of Methodism in this country in connexion with our Conference; and towards them in return we should continue to deem it alike our duty and our privilege to cherish sentiments of respect and affection.

3. Though every reasonable effort has been made on the part of our Conference to maintain the Articles of the Union inviolate, and to prevent a dissolution of it, the circumstances which have transpired—the system of espionage upon our proceedings and the official and private conversations of our Preachers which has been carried on by official members of the British Conference associated with us, the clandestine and slanderous correspondence between them and the Missionary Secretaries in London, and their party agitations amongst us, and the interference of the Missionary Secretaries with our local and internal affairs—render it very doubtful whether its operations could have been harmoniously and advantageously maintained for any great length of time; in addition to which circumstances may be mentioned, the strong inclinations that are cherished and the efforts which are being made by leading Members of the British Conference, and especially on the part of the Missionary Secretaries, under whose control and management the affairs of Canada must always be placed—to introduce the use of *gowns* into Methodist pulpits, and the use of the *forms of prayer and the liturgy* into Methodist Chapels as far as possible throughout their whole work;* the almost universal opposition in the British Conference to Societies whose object is to promote total abstinence from the

* *Note by E. R.*—It is not intended to cast any reflection upon those Clergy who wear *gowns* and use the *Liturgy*, but they constitute no part of the paraphernalia of METHODISM; and we think those who desire the use of them had better go to the Church of England, where such appendages to public worship appear appropriate, than to attempt to introduce the use of them into METHODIST CONGREGATIONS.

ordinary use of all spirituous liquors, and their prohibition of the use of their Chapels for the meetings of any such Societies. In these, as well as in other matters, an "efficient direction," would, of course, be soon claimed "over the proceedings" of our Church, in order to maintain our adherence to principles and proceedings to which, as it would be stated, the Body in England had pledged itself.

4. The circumstances under which the English Conference have refused to continue the Union, place our Church in the most favorable position which could have been desired in the event of such an occurrence. This proceeding of the English Conference is not based upon the alleged, much less proved violation of any article of the Union on the part of our Conference, but upon our non-compliance with demands and conditions which amount to so many *new* Articles of Union. All contracts are binding upon each of the contracting parties. Articles of contract or agreement can only be dissolved by mutual consent of the parties concerned, by death, or by legal process. The act of the British Conference, therefore, under the circumstances referred to, is no *dissolution* of the Union; but a *Secession* from it, and involves all the consequences of a *secession* to the Seceder, and corresponding advantages to the party seceded from. A party seceding from a contract incurs, at least, the loss of all that he had acquired under the contract. The Articles of Union remain effective to our Conference until it agrees to the dissolution. Our connexion is therefore secure in the legal possession of all the Missions, the appointment of the Missionaries, and the election of the President: we have not to alter a single line of our Discipline; the position of our Conference is unchanged, though the position of the English Conference is essentially changed. We have only to proceed onward in our work of faith and labour of love, minding the same thing, and perfectly joined together in the same judgment and in the same heart—redoubling our united exertions in support of the cause of Missions as well as the cause of personal piety and of pure religion generally—trusting in the name and promises of Him who hath always caused us to "triumph in every place," and the days of peace, of joy, and success will return upon us with more than former splendour.

WILLIAM RYERSON,
EGERTON RYERSON.

Toronto, Sept. 23, 1840.

APPENDIX

TO THE FOREGOING REPORT.

No. 1.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE COMMITTEE IN LONDON.

Resolutions of a Committee appointed by the British Conference of 1839, to decide finally in all Matters relating to the Union existing between the British Conference and the Upper Canada Conference, and to the Indian Missions in Upper Canada, 77, Hatton Garden, Wednesday, 29th of April, 1840.

The Committee having before them various documents showing that some of the Pledges given at the last Canadian Conference have not been fulfilled, especially in the conduct of the Rev. Egerton Ryerson, in the management of the *Christian Guardian*;—and also, a letter from Mr. Under-Secretary Vernon Smith, addressed to Dr. Alder, stating that a representation had been received from Mr. Ryerson, urging the claim of the Upper Canada Conference, to the exclusive management of the yearly grant received by the Wesleyan Missionary Society,—which letter was accompanied by a despatch from the Governor-General of Canada on the subject, and inclosing a copy of Mr. Ryerson's letter to His Excellency, have come to the following resolutions:—

I. That just grounds of complaint exist against the Rev. Egerton Ryerson, particularly on the following points:—

1. That Mr. Ryerson, as it appears to the Committee, in his recent communications with the Governor-General, and on other occasions, has virtually and practically superseded the Rev. Jos. Stinson, the regularly appointed President of the Upper Canada Conference, and therefore the official Agent and Representative of the Wesleyan body in Upper Canada, during the interim of its sittings;—and has thus acted with great and culpable irregularity.

2. That in the judgment of this Committee Mr. Ryerson has discovered an utter want of ingenuousness and integrity in thus attempting to gain the possession, on behalf of the Canadian Conference, in whole or in part, of the grant made by the Crown to the Wesleyan Missionary Society, and that he has in this matter committed a flagrant violation of the obligations arising from the union between the two Conferences.

3. That the *Christian Guardian*, of which Mr. Ryerson is the editor, instead of being conducted according to express stipulation and promise made to Dr.

Alder, and the direction of the Canada Conference, as a religious paper, has become more than ever a political and party organ, and that Mr. Ryerson's attempted defence of its proceedings, by an allusion to the alleged official authority of the Watchman newspaper, in England, is founded in a gross misrepresentation of facts, in as much as the British Conference has no political or religious organ whatever but its own recognised periodicals, and has none, but the proprietors and editors of the Watchman, not one of whom is a minister, are responsible for its contents.

II. That the Committee are far from implicating the whole or any part of the members of the Upper Canada Conference, in these unjustifiable proceedings of Mr. Ryerson, and cannot but hope that they will utterly repudiate them at their next annual sitting, and mark the sense which they entertain of such a dishonest attempt to deprive the Wesleyan Missionary Committee of their just and righteous claims, on the plighted faith of the British Crown and government, by partial, clandestine, and unauthorised representation, in such manner as the nature of the case requires; and that they will place the Christian Guardian, if it must be continued as a newspaper at all, in such hands as will at least secure the fulfilment of the oft-repeated promise, that it shall be exclusively a *religious publication*. The Committee are the more encouraged to hope that the Conference will adopt this course, from the report of Dr. Alder, that various members of that body had expressed to him the deepest grief at the political course pursued by Mr. Ryerson, in conducting the Christian Guardian, and their earnest desire to maintain unimpaired, on just and proper principles, the union which now exists between the two Conferences.

III. If, however, this reasonable expectation should be disappointed, and a majority of the Canada Conference, at their next sitting, should be found to support and encourage such proceedings as those of which the Committee complain, it will be their painful duty to recommend to the next British Conference, to dissolve the union which at present subsists between the two Conferences, and to adopt such measures for the maintenance and extension of the Indian missions in Upper Canada, as may appear to be necessary.

IV. That the Committee are deeply sensible of the injury to the cause of God and to the interests of the province which may be anticipated from a dissolution of the union, and are anxious, if possible, to prevent their occurrence; of which anxiety the British Conference have given repeated proof, by the deputations they have sent to Canada, and the other measures they have adopted. If, therefore, the Canadian Conference should deem it to be its duty to send a Representative to the next British Conference, for the purpose of offering any explanations, or of making proposals with a view to perpetuating the union; or should that be found impracticable, for the purpose of making such arrangements as may prevent unseemly and unchristian collisions between members of the two divisions of the same great family, the Committee assure the Canadian Conference, that such Representative will be received with cordial affection by the British Conference, and that every attention will be paid to his statements and representations.

V. That whatever may be the result of these affairs, the Committee take it for granted that no objection or opposition will be offered to the Wesleyan Missionary Committee retaining its direction of the Indian missions in Upper Canada,—missions which they were instrumental in saving from ruin, and on which they have expended so large a proportion of their attention and of their funds: but should any objection or opposition be offered from any quarter to their doing so, the Committee, in virtue of the power vested in them by the British Conference, recommend and direct, that under no circumstances shall any one of the missions amongst the Aborigines be voluntarily abandoned by the Wesleyan Missionary Society.

ELIJAH HOOLE.

77, Hatton Garden, London, April 30th, 1840.

Extract of a Letter from R. VERNON SMITH, M. P., Under Colonial Secretary, dated Downing Street, 15th of April, 1840.

SIR—I am directed by Lord JOHN RUSSELL to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 8th instant, requesting, on behalf of the Wesleyan Missionary Society, an interview with his lordship on matters affecting the operations of the Society in Upper Canada, and requesting his lordship's attention more especially to the claim of the Society's annual grant of £700, which they have hitherto enjoyed from the revenue of that province.

His lordship desires me in reply to inform you, that he has already received from the Governor-General, a despatch on the subject to which your letter relates, accompanied by a representation from Mr. Ryerson, explaining the nature of the financial affairs between the British Wesleyan Conference in England, and the Conference of the Wesleyan Methodists in Upper Canada, and urging the claim of the latter to the exclusive management of the yearly grant.

Under these circumstances it appears to his lordship that the most convenient course will be to afford the British Wesleyan Conference in England, the opportunity of discussing the proposal which Mr. Ryerson has made. He has, therefore, directed me to furnish you with a copy of that gentleman's communication, and to acquaint you that he will be ready to consider any objections which the Wesleyan Missionary Society may have to urge to a compliance with the proposal which it contains. I have the honour to be, &c.

(Signed)

R. VERNON SMITH.

To the Rev. R. Alder,
Wesleyan Mission House, 77, Hatton Garden.

No. 3.

Copy of a Letter, addressed to the Governor General of Canada by the Rev. Egerton Ryerson, dated Toronto, Jan. 17, 1840.

MAY IT PLEASE YOUR EXCELLENCY,

I proceed to state in as few words as possible, the nature of the financial relations which exist between the British Wesleyan Conference in England and the Conference of the Wesleyan Methodist Church in Upper Canada. In the year 1784, the late Rev. J. Wesley recommended the formation of the Methodist Societies in America into a distinct and independent Body, with the attributes and style of a Church—he having appointed general Superintendants, or Bishops, to perform Ordination, &c., among them. It was by persons who had been ordained and appointed by these American Bishops, that the Methodist Church was established in Upper Canada. Down to 1833, the Methodist Church in this Province had no more ecclesiastical connection with the Wesleyan Conference in England, than exists between the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States and the Established Church of England. In 1833, an arrangement was agreed upon by the Wesleyan Conference in this Province and that in England, by which a co-operation was to take place in the labors of the two bodies in Upper Canada. That arrangement consists of certain regulations, called 'Articles of Union.' These Articles provide that the Conference in England may, when they see fit, appoint a person to preside over the Canada Conference, the same as the Crown appoints a Commissioner to preside in the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland; but, that the Canadian Preachers shall have no claim upon the funds of the British Conference.

It was also agreed, that the British Conference should assume the responsibility of supporting the Indian Missions, which had been, or might thereafter be, established in Upper Canada. They have also agreed to employ Canadian Preachers on those missions; but the Conference in England is the judge of the amount to be expended in each and every year; and the moment any preacher is disabled for the mission work, or ceases to be actively employed in it, he can receive nothing from the funds of the British Conference, but is entirely dependent upon the Canadian Conference. It will therefore be observed, that there are two departments of the work, in connexion with the Wesleyan cause in this Province; namely—what we call, the *regular* or *circuit* work, and the *mission* work. In carrying on the former, no claim can be made upon the funds of the British Conference; in carrying on the latter, the British Conference has agreed to assume the pecuniary responsibility, and is the sole judge of the extent of it and the amount of expenditure.

The former embraces 47 circuits, and the latter embraces 14 circuits—*five* among the New Settlements, and *nine* amongst the Aboriginal Indian Tribes. On many of the *regular* circuits, the congregations are unable to pay more than two-thirds, and in some instances not more than one-half, of the disciplinary salary or allowance of the Preachers. The loss of such deficiencies must be endured by the Preachers concerned, unless, as in the case of Mr. Richey, they happen to be members of the British Conference; as we have not as yet any funds to supply them, and have no claims upon the funds of the British Conference for that purpose.

The same remark applies to chapels that are in embarrassed circumstances, and also to places where chapels are needed, but where the inhabitants are not able to pay more than a part of the amount necessary to build them. It may also be observed, that, in addition to doing all that is done towards supporting the regular circuit work, and building all the chapels that are built in connexion with it, annual collections and subscriptions are made throughout all our congregations, in aid of the funds of the British Wesleyan Missionary Society. These collections and subscriptions amount to from one thousand to fifteen hundred pounds per annum.

It is therefore perfectly clear, that a Government grant to the British Wesleyan Conference, and a grant to the Conference of the Wesleyan Methodist Church in Canada, are two very different things. That the latter is not in any way benefited by grants to the former, will appear obvious, for the following reasons:—

1. The Canadian Conference collects more than the sum necessary to support the five missions to the New Settlements, and the nine Indian missions were established previously to 1833, when the British Conference agreed to assume the responsibility of supporting them.

2. The Government grants were discontinued for two or three years, but it did not in the least affect the Canadian missions; although if the society in England had had additional sums equal to those grants at their disposal those years, they would have extended their missionary operations in other parts of the world in a corresponding ratio, as they are multiplying their various missions (except in Upper Canada) in proportion to the increase of their funds.

3. The Government grants are not acknowledged in any reports of the Conference of the Wesleyan Methodist Church in Canada, but in the annual reports of the Wesleyan Missionary Society in London.

The annual appropriations for the Canadian missions are made in June of each year, and should a dissolution of the Union take place between the bodies, as intimated to your Excellency by Messrs. Stinson and Richey, the Conference in England would claim the missions in this Province—notwithstanding their original establishment by the Canadian Conference, and the annual collections made to support them. But I apprehend no disposition on the part of

the British Conference to dissolve the Union, unless they can get Government aid independent of the Canadian Conference to prosecute their views.

I conceive therefore that any grants intended to benefit the Wesleyan Methodist Church in Canada, ought undoubtedly to be placed at the disposal of the Conference of that Church.

I have, &c.

[Signed] EGERTON RYERSON.

[NOTE, BY E. RYERSON.—When I wrote the foregoing letter, I had not the remotest idea that it would ever be laid before Her Majesty's Secretary of State for the Colonies; and, therefore, it could not have been an application to his Lordship on any subject. Mr. Vernon Smith has inadvertently attributed to me what was recommended by His Excellency the Governor General of Canada. The recommendation was also spontaneous on the part of His Excellency, and flowed from his own sense of justice and sound policy, after the most thorough investigation of the subject. My letter was also dictated to a considerable degree by certain communications which Mr. Stinson and Mr. Richey had made to His Excellency. A full explanation of the circumstances under which I wrote the above letter will be found in the former part of the letter addressed by the Representatives of the Wesleyan Conference in Canada to Lord John Russell, in reply to Dr. Alder.]

No. 4.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE CANADA CONFERENCE.

Extracts from the Journal of the Conference of the Wesleyan Methodist Church in Canada, assembled at Belleville, Upper Canada, June, 1840.

Friday Morning, June 12th.

“ Resumed the question in relation to the examination of character.

“ On the name of Egerton Ryerson being called, the President of the Conference presented certain documents from a committee of the British Wesleyan conference. The documents were read, headed as follows, viz. :

“ 1. Extract of a letter from R. Vernon Smith, M. P., Under Colonial Secretary, addressed to Dr. Alder, 15 April, 1840.

“ 2. A copy of a letter addressed to the Governor General of Canada, by the Rev. E. Ryerson, dated Toronto, 17 January, 1840.

“ 3. Copy of the resolutions of a committee appointed by the British conference of 1839 to decide finally on all matters relating to the Union existing between the British conference and the Upper Canada conference, and the Indian missions in Upper Canada, 77 Hatton Garden, Wednesday, 29 April, 1840.

“ Resolved,—That these documents be taken into consideration on Monday morning, the 15th instant.

Monday, June 15th.

“ Proceeded to take up the documents transmitted from the committee of the British Wesleyan conference in England, in relation to Egerton Ryerson.

“ The Assistant Secretary read, first the letter of the Rev. E. Ryerson to the Governor General of Canada; secondly, extract of a letter from R. Vernon Smith, Esq. M. P. to Dr. Alder; thirdly, resolutions of a committee of the British Wesleyan conference in London, dated 77 Hatton Garden, April 29, 1840, and signed ‘Elijah Hoole.’

Mr. Richey appeared as the accuser in behalf of the London committee. After a lengthened address M. Richey moved, seconded by E. Evans, that it be

Resolved—"That this Conference has heard with great surprise and regret, of Brother Egerton Ryerson's attempt to deprive the British Wesleyan Missionary Committee, of the annual grant received by them from the imperial government, to enable them to extend their missions in this province; and that they utterly repudiate such proceedings on the part of Mr. Ryerson, not only as irregular and unauthorised, but directly opposed to a resolution adopted by this Conference at its last session, rescinding the second, fifth, and sixth resolutions, passed by this Conference in June, 1837, on the subject of the grants in question, because those resolutions were represented by Mr. Alder as interfering with the usages of the British Brethren, and calculated materially to retard their interests."

Tuesday, June 16th.

Met at 8, A. M., reading, singing, and prayer. Resumed the consideration of the documents relative to E. Ryerson.

The memorial of the Rev. Joseph Stinson, President of the Conference, and the Rev. Matthew Richey, Superintendent of Toronto city circuit to His Excellency the Right Hon. Charles Poulett Thomson, Governor-General of Canada, on the subject of the Clergy Reserves was read. Mr. E. Ryerson proceeded to address the Conference. Adjourned.

Conference met at 2 o'clock, P. M., singing and prayer. Mr. E. Ryerson proceeded in and closed his address. Adjourned.

Wednesday, June 17th.

Conference met at 8 A. M., reading, singing, and prayer. Resumed the consideration of the resolutions of the London Committee. After considerable discussion the resolution introduced by Mr. Richey was put, when the yeas and nays were ordered to be taken.

YEAS.—A. Prindel, M. Richey, M. Lang, J. Norris, William Scott, E. Evans, J. Douse, and Benjamin Slight—8.*

* During the investigation of the matter, Mr. E. Ryerson was asked whether he *intended* his letter to the Governor General to be an *application* for the Grant which had been made to the Wesleyan Missionary Committee in London. He declined giving any answer to the question, leaving his letter to speak for itself, and leaving his Brethren to judge according to the evidence before them. After the Conference had decided on the question, Mr. E. Ryerson rose and said he *now* felt himself at liberty to answer the question which had been proposed to him respecting his *intentions*; he *intended* his letter to the Governor General to be precisely what the Governor General had understood, and had stated it in a despatch to Lord John Russell to be,—an exposition of the *financial relations* of the Wesleyan Conference in England and the Conference of the Wesleyan Methodist Church in Canada. He *intended*, secondly, that whatever public aid was intended for the benefit of the Wesleyan Methodist Church in Canada, should be placed at the disposal of the Conference of that Church. But whether the grant which had heretofore been paid to the Missionary Committee in London, was *intended* in any way whatever to benefit the Wesleyan Methodist Church in Canada, he (Mr. E. Ryerson) had not intended to express, and had not expressed, any opinion. On this statement being made, one, if not two or three, of those who had voted in the minority of *eight* observed, that had they heard that statement previously to recording their votes, they would have voted with the majority. A day or two afterwards, when the communication from the Governor General was received and read in relation to the allegations of the London Committee, others who had voted in the minority of eight, expressed a wish to change their votes; but Mr. Ryerson objected to it as irregular, and as setting an improper precedent—expressing his conviction that every member of the Conference on one side as well as the other had recorded his vote honestly, according to the best of his judgment, and the evidence he had before him when his vote was given.

NAYS.—*S. Belton, E. Stoney, H. Biggar, T. Fawcett, W. Case, R. Heyland, C. R. Allison, J. Musgrove, E. Shepherd, J. Scott, C. Flummerfelt, J. McIntire, R. Jones, J. Black, E. Heally, William Haw, B. Naukeville, S. Hurlburt, William Willoughby, P. Jones, C. Vandusen, L. Warner, A. Green, J. Ryerson, J. G. Manly, J. Brock, J. Beatty, S. Rose, J. Carroll, D. Bcrny, D. Hardy, V. B. Howard, G. Miller, H. Wilkinson, R. Corson, Edwcy Ryerson, H. Shaler, D. Wright, W. H. Williams, D. McMullen, W. Ryerson, A. M'Nabb, T. Bevitt, H. Montgomery, A. Hurlburt, Ezra Adams, M. Whiting, A. Adams, J. Baxter, J. Messmore, S. Waldron, W. Young, J. Law, G. Pool, M' Mullen, P. Ker, G. H. Playter, H. Dean, and J. Lever*—59.

The resolution of Mr. Richey was therefore negatived by a majority of fifty-one.

S. Miles and S. Huntingdon were excused from voting, as they had not been able, in consequence of indisposition, to attend during the whole investigation of the matter.

Brother Steer was excused from voting on the ground of conscientious scruples, as he could not make up his judgment.

Adjourned.

Friday, June 19th.

After the most mature consideration of the several subjects referred to in the resolutions of the Committee of the English Wesleyan Conference, dated, 77, Hatton Garden, London, 29th April, 1840, the following resolutions were adopted :

Resolved—

I. That we cannot recognize any right on the part of the Committee, to interfere with the Canada Conference in the management of our own internal affairs (except as provided for by the Articles of Union,) and especially with our views and proceedings on the question of the Clergy Reserves ; as we are precluded by the articles of union with the English Conference from all claims upon its funds, and as our own uncontrolled action and interests have always been reserved and admitted in relation to the question of the Clergy Reserves.

II. That, as the articles of union between the English and Canada conferences expressly secure to the Canadian preachers all their rights and privileges inviolate, we consider it at variance with the letter and spirit of those articles and an anomalous and alarming precedent, for the committee in London to accuse and condemn a member of this conference, and then to enjoin upon us to carry their sentence into execution on pain of a dissolution of the union.

III. That whilst we have always maintained, and are resolved to maintain, to the fullest extent, the dignity and authority of the office of president as provided for in our Rules and in the Articles of Union, we are impelled by an imperative sense of duty to decline acceding to the claim put forth by the committee in London, that the President appointed in England is to be regarded by virtue of his office " the Agent and Representative of the Wesleyan body in Upper Canada " in the transaction of affairs with the Government, in which the interests of our Church are involved ; as we have always, in anticipation of such transactions, appointed a Committee or Representative to guard and represent the views and interests of our Church ; especially as this Conference, at its last session, appointed the Rev. Egerton Ryerson as its special Representative to confer with the Government on matters affecting our civil and religious rights and interests ; and we can discover no good reason to depart from an established and proper usage.

IV. That it appears to this Conference, that a proper regard to the rights and interests of the Wesleyan Methodist Church in Canada, rendered it the imperative duty of the Rev. Egerton Ryerson to confer and correspond with

His Excellency the Governor General of Canada on our financial affairs; and we fully concur in the exposition which Mr. Ryerson has given of the financial relations between the English and Canadian conferences in his letter to the Governor-General, dated Toronto, Jan. 17, 1840. And whilst we disclaim any wish to interfere with the legitimate claims of the Wesleyan Missionary Society upon the faith and liberality of Her Majesty's Government, we learn with feelings of gratitude, that the rights and interests of the Wesleyan body in this province have been brought under the consideration of Her Majesty's Secretary of State for the colonies by His Excellency the Governor-General; and we are prepared to submit to the decision of the proper authorities respecting them.

V. That in reference to the last Resolution of the Committee in London, declaring their intention, under any circumstances, to claim, and, if possible, to secure the possession of the Indian missions in Upper Canada; this Conference, considering that those Missions, with two or three exceptions, were established by our exertions prior to 1833 (when the Articles of Union were agreed to) and that they have, in a great measure, been supported by funds obtained in this province, and sustained chiefly by the Ministrations and labours of Canadian preachers and teachers, we cannot regard it as reasonable, or our providential duty, under any circumstances, to relinquish our pastoral connexion with those missions which were established previously to the Union.

VI. That firmly believing, as we do, that the resolutions of the Committee in London have been adopted upon erroneous impressions; and being satisfied that our fathers and brethren in England have not intended, nor could intend, anything unkind, towards the members of this connexion, or unjust to its interests; and deeply anxious as we are to maintain inviolate and unimpaired the principles and Articles of Union between the English and Canadian Conferences; and being determined to do all in our power to prevent the dissolution of the Union, therefore resolved, That a delegation be sent to the Wesleyan Conference in England, to lay all the matters referred to in these resolutions before that venerable body, and to use all proper means to prevent collision between the two connexions.

Resolved, That the delegation to be sent to England on the subjects of the foregoing resolutions consist of two.

Proceeded to ballot for representatives to England,—Votes, Egerton Ryerson, 51; William Ryerson, 43; several scattering votes.

Egerton and William Ryerson were declared duly elected.

Moved by W. Case, seconded by Egerton Ryerson, and

Resolved, That our respected brother, the Rev. Joseph Stinson, be requested to accompany our delegation to England, to confer upon the matters pending between the British and Canadian connexions.

[The following documents were read by Mr E. Ryerson before the Conference, assembled in Belleville, in June, in reply to the allegations contained in the Resolutions of the London Committee. No 5 was read to show the nature of Messrs. Stinson and Richey's first communications with the Governor-General on the question of the Clergy Reserves. No. 6 was read to show the nature of Mr E. Ryerson's first communications with the Governor-General on the subject of the Government Grant. Nos. 7 and 8 were read to illustrate the conclusion of the Governor-General that the Grant was made to the Wesleyan Missionary committee in London in view of a union with the Wesleyan Body in Upper Canada. No. 9 was read to show that Mr. Alder himself, at the time he was in Upper Canada negotiating with Sir John Colborne on the subject of the Grant, not only contemplated a union, but a *financial* union, with the Canada Conference. No. 10 was read to show the circumstances under which the union was proposed by the Canada Conference, and to prove that it was not proposed in order to "save the Missions in Upper Canada from ruin."]

No. 5.

Memorial of the Rev. Joseph Stinson, and the Rev. M. Richey, to the Governor-General of Canada.

To His Excellency the Right Hon POULETT THOMSON, Governor-General of the British Provinces in North America.

MAY IT PLEASE YOUR EXCELLENCY,

Sustaining, as we do, an intimate and responsible relation to the Methodist Church in this province in connexion with the British Wesleyan Conference, we deem it imperative upon us at this important crisis to lay before Your Excellency an explicit statement of our views and wishes in reference to the Clergy Reserves.

The frankness and condescension which characterized the communications which Your Excellency was pleased to make to us during the interview with which you honoured us yesterday, encourage us to believe that Your Excellency will not regard the following brief expression of our opinion as unworthy of consideration, in any measure that may be recommended for the final adjustment of this question.

We entirely concur in sentiment with Your Excellency as to the propriety of maintaining, in any disposition that may be made of the Reserves, a sacred and undeviating regard to the religious objects of their original donation. The Church of England being, in our estimation, *the Established Church* of all the British colonies, we entertain no objection to the distinct recognition of her as such; and had the Reserves been exclusively appropriated to her, according to the original intention of His Gracious Majesty George the Third, we should not have interfered with this matter; but as the disposition of them has been referred to the Colonial Legislature, we confess we are entirely at a loss to conceive any just reason why the Wesleyan Methodist Church should be placed in a position in any degree inferior to the Church of Scotland.

We would respectfully suggest, that, as she possesses no claims as an establishment in this Province, the only ostensible ground of her being recognised in any way as superior to the Wesleyan Methodist Church, must be founded in the numerical superiority of her ministry and membership,—a claim which it is matter of notoriety she cannot sustain, and therefore she has no just pretensions to such superiority.

We would also beg leave to remind Your Excellency that the Imperial Government have deemed the labours of Wesleyan Missionaries of such import-

ance as to lead them to urge the extension of their Missionary operations in this province, and have given us the strongest assurances of their liberal and continued support.

In any settlement of this important question that may be made, we regard it of vital importance to the permanent peace and prosperity of the Province, as a British colony, that the sum to be appropriated to us be given to the Wesleyan Methodists who are now, AND WHO MAY BE HEREAFTER CONNECTED WITH THE BRITISH WESLEYAN CONFERENCE. We have the honour to be, Your Excellency's very humble and obedient servants,

J. STINSON, *President of the Conference.*

M. RICHEY, *Superintendent of Toronto City.*

Toronto, January 3, 1840.

No. 6.

Rev. E. Ryerson to His Excellency the Governor-General, respecting the Government Grant to the British Conference.

Toronto, January 2, 1840.

MAY IT PLEASE YOUR EXCELLENCY,

In accordance with Your Excellency's request, I recapitulate in writing the leading facts relative to the Government grant to the British Conference. I know not that I can do it more satisfactorily than by making the following references:—

I refer Your Excellency to the Earl of Ripon's letter to Lord Glenelg (dated Carlton Gardens, 4th April, 1836) and Lord Glenelg's despatch to His Excellency the Governor-General, to Sir F. B. Head (dated April 15, 1836) for a statement of the circumstances under which this grant was originally made, and subsequently revived. These documents are contained in the printed paper that I left with Your Excellency.

The only material point is, as to whether this grant is made in aid of the funds of a body in England, or in Upper Canada.

On this point I beg to direct Your Excellency's attention to the following official documents:—1. Mr. Secretary Rowan's letter to "The British Wesleyan and Canadian Wesleyan Conference," dated "Government House, March 15, 1833;" 2. Letter from Mr. Secretary Rowan to "The Wesleyan Methodist Conference," dated "Government House, Toronto, July 4, 1834;" 3. Letter from the Rev. Joseph Stinson to His Excellency Sir John Colborne, dated "City of Toronto, July 7, 1834." These documents will be found in the accompanying book, entitled, "Seventh Report of the committee on Grievances," (the volume immortalized by Sir F. B. Head in his "Narrative") pp. 153—155.

As to the light in which this grant has always been viewed by the Conference of the Wesleyan Methodist Church in this Province, see the Resolutions adopted in 1837, in the accompanying printed minutes, pp. 24—28.

As to the relation in which the Conference in Canada stands to the Conference in England and its funds, see the Articles of Union between the two bodies, in the accompanying book, entitled, "Doctrines and Discipline of the Wesleyan Methodist Church in Canada," pp. 137—142.

I have the honour to be, &c.,

(Signed)

EGERTON RYERSON.

Letter from Colonel Rowan, Secretary to Sir John Colborne, in reply to a letter from the Rev. A. Green, Wesleyan Minister in Canada, inquiring into the circumstances under which the Grants had been made by Government to certain Churches in Canada, and for whom the Grant to the Wesleyan Methodists was intended.

Government House, Toronto, June 30, 1835.

SIR,—I am directed by the Lieutenant-Governor to acquaint you, with reference to your letter of the 22nd instant, that the sums granted in aid of the different Churches in Canada were all sanctioned, in consequence of petitions to His Majesty's Government—and at the time the appropriation alluded to in your communication was made, His Majesty's Government supposed the Wesleyan Methodists in this Province were under the control of the British Conference.

For any further information you may require on the subject, I am directed to refer you to the correspondence which was laid before the House of Assembly last session.

I am, &c.

Rev. A. Green.

(Signed)

WM. ROWAN.

No. 8.

Extract of a letter from the Earl of Ripon to Lord Glenelg, dated "Carlton Gardens," [London] April 4th, 1836."

"It is correctly stated that I had various communications with the Wesleyan Methodist Society in this country in the year 1832, upon the subject of their operations in Upper Canada, and of the desire entertained by the Wesleyans in that Province to PLACE themselves in close and continuous connexion with the Parent Society in England. In the course of these communications I became so impressed with the importance of the objects which the Society, both at Home and in Canada, had in view, that I thought it expedient to encourage their exertions, and to instruct the Governor to give them some pecuniary assistance from those funds which were legally at the disposal of the Crown."

No. 9.

Extract of a letter from the Rev. R. Alder to the Conference assembled in Hallowell, (U. C.) dated "Kingston, (U. C.) August 16, 1832."

"That the [London] Committee shall be at liberty to appoint such persons to labour in connexion with this [Canada] Conference, as they may deem to be properly qualified for the sacred office, and that the Conference will not multiply preachers or CIRCUITS within its boundaries until they shall have corresponded with the committee. This is asked on the ground, as the committee is expected to grant an annual sum of money for the support and extension of the work in Canada, they ought to be associated with the Conference in determining how many preachers shall be employed, that their funds may not be embarrassed, nor the necessary comforts of the preachers be diminished by the employment of a greater number of ministers than the means placed at your disposal will justify."

CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN THE WESLEYAN MISSIONARY COMMITTEE IN LONDON, AND THE MISSIONARY BOARD OF THE WESLEYAN METHODIST CHURCH IN CANADA, PREVIOUSLY TO THE UNION BETWEEN THE TWO BODIES.

Resolutions and Letter of the Wesleyan Missionary Committee in London.

Mr. Ryerson, from Upper Canada, accompanied by the Rev. Peter Jones, a converted Indian chief, were introduced to the committee, having statements to make, and arrangements to propose, respecting the prosecution of the missions in that Province, and especially among the Indian tribes. After hearing their statements, and considering what might be the probable effects of their plans on their own missions and missionary subscriptions, it was Resolved—

1st. That Mr. Turner be immediately written to, to inquire respecting the facilities which may exist as to the commencement of a mission to the Indians in Upper Canada among such tribes as have not yet been visited by missionaries, such mission having been long contemplated.

2nd. That a grant of the sum of three hundred pounds be made to Messrs. Ryerson and Jones for the use of the missions already commenced among the Indians by the Canadian Methodist body, as a proof of christian and brotherly affection to our Canadian brethren.

3rd. That in consequence of this grant, the brethren *Ryerson and Jones have agreed and will be expected to give their best assistance to our friends at such meetings as they may have opportunity of attending while they remain in England, without making private and personal applications for subscriptions to any of our own friends.*

London, Wesleyan Mission House, June 13, 1831.

DEAR BROTHER,—At the instance of the Missionary committee, I now transmit to you a copy of the resolutions entered into by them, on the introduction of Messrs. Ryerson and Jones, and receiving their statements relative to your missions, and the object of the visit of the deputation to England. They rejoiced to receive them as brethren, and sincerely congratulated them on the success with which your missionaries have been favoured, by the blessing of God, among the native tribes of Indians. An impression—deep, affectionate, and highly favourable to the Indian Mission—has been made by the addresses of brother Jones at our own and several other public meetings of a benevolent character, as well as by the amiableness, intelligence, and piety of his general intercourse with ourselves and our friends in different places. We exceedingly regret the severe indisposition by which he has for some weeks been prevented from more generally visiting our societies in other parts of the kingdom, but from which, we are thankful to hear, he is now recovering, and are therefore hoping that he will soon be in a state of convalescence. During his sickness, which occurred at Bristol, and which there is reason to believe originated in a violent cold taken by travelling on the outside of the coach from Liverpool to London immediately after his arrival, he has been at the house of a most kind and attentive friend, Mr. James Wood, jun., son of our venerable brother the Rev. James Wood, where he has received every medical and domestic attention. Mr. Ryerson, who resides at the mission house, continues in good health.

From the annexed "Resolutions," you will observe that the committee have decided upon commencing their long contemplated mission to the Indians, convinced that where the field is so wide there need be no fear of any unpleasant or conflicting feelings among the missionaries who may be employed. The idea was suggested to your deputation, whether it would be agreeable to you to

place the whole of your Indian missions under our direction, as we might perhaps succeed in raising funds for a greater extent of missionary operation than could be at present raised by yourselves; but as they seemed to think the proposal would not be accepted, they resolved to show their brotherly kindness and interest in the success of the mission to the aborigines of America, by a donation of £300, to which they were the more readily induced by a wish to accomplish a part of the object of your deputation, which they understood to be that of raising funds by soliciting subscriptions and donations, but which they were aware could not be done in addition to the applications of their own preachers and friends, without some danger of painful collision. They were happy to find the proposal met the approbation of both Messrs. Ryerson and Jones, who consequently agreed not to make application to any of our own friends, reserving the liberty of applying to those of other denominations, who were not contributors to our own funds. They also agreed to assist at any public meetings we might wish them to attend during their stay in this country, all travelling expenses being borne by the Missionary Committee.

You will also perceive by the above "resolutions," that whilst the Committee desire to manifest the most cordial affection to their American brethren, and entertain a sincere wish for the prosperity of their missions, they feel themselves obliged to state their conviction, that applications from other quarters to the societies in England, would be both injurious to their own funds, and involve the Connexion in unpleasant party disputes, and consequently, *that in case of any future attempt to raise such contributions from our friends, they would regard it as an imperative duty to discountenance them.*

Your official letter will, in course, agreeably to your desire, be transmitted to the President, to be laid before the ensuing Conference, from whom you will most probably receive a reciprocation of friendly and brotherly communication.

In the mean time, I am,

On behalf of the Wesleyan Missionary Committee,
Your affectionate brother in the gospel,

JAMES TOWNLEY, *Secretary.*

The Rev. William Case, &c. &c.

Reply of the Canadian Wesleyan Missionary Board to the London Wesleyan Missionary Committee.

By order of the Conference, the resolutions of the London Methodist Missionary Committee, held the 11th of May, and the accompanying letter from the Rev. Dr. Townley, dated "London, Wesleyan Mission House, June 13, 1831," addressed to the Rev. William Case, were taken into consideration. After carefully considering the several subjects referred to in these documents, it was Resolved—

1st. It is matter of thankfulness to Almighty God, and to our Methodist brethren in England, that Messrs. Ryerson and Jones have been kindly received and entertained in their mission to Great Britain; and that the addresses and intercourse of Mr. Jones have produced upon the public mind in that country "an impression deep, affectionate, and highly favourable" to the cause of missions.

2nd. That it affords us much pleasure to learn that our Methodist brethren in Great Britain feel a deep interest in the christianization and improvement of the aborigines of British North America.

3rd. That our sincere thanks be given to the Methodist Missionary Committee in London, for the grant of three hundred pounds in aid of our Indian missions.

4th. That we learn with the deepest regret, that in a measure which so seriously concerns the interest of the Methodist connexion in Upper Canada,

our missionary operations in particular, and the honour of Methodism and the cause of religion generally, our brethren of the London Methodist Missionary Committee have, without consulting their Methodist brethren in Upper Canada, determined to establish a mission among us, separate from our Connexion.

5th. That the formation of a distinct Methodist society or Societies in Upper Canada, by the London Methodist Missionary Committee, is contrary to the understanding which has heretofore been given by the English Conference, that their missionaries should not form societies separate from ours in Upper Canada; whilst at the same time our missionaries were not to interfere with the arrangements or operations of their missions in Lower Canada.

6th. That it would be a matter of very deep regret should the Methodist Missionary Committee in London determine to establish a mission in Upper Canada among any of the Indian tribes situated North and East of Lake Huron, as all these parts of the Province are embraced within the actual labours of our Conference; as our own missionaries have with greater or less success visited all these tribes, and we have established missions or regular missionary appointments among them all; as no missionary society beyond the Atlantic can possess the same facilities with ours of doing an equal amount of good with the same means; as the formation of a Methodist Society in Upper Canada, distinct from that already established, is a disavowal of the already recognized principle, that "the Wesleyan Methodists are one in every part of the world"—it will in all probability produce serious misunderstandings and party disputes in our Connexion—make unfavourable impressions upon the minds of the Indians, by attempts at forming *distinct* societies of professedly the same people among them—and do material injury to our missionary funds in this Province.

7th. That if the Methodist Missionary Committee in London shall determine to establish a mission or missions among any of the numerous tribes West or North of the Lake Huron, or in the vicinity of Hudson's Bay, we will do all in our power to assist them, by furnishing them with Indian translations of the Gospel, Hymns, &c., and Native labourers, as far as we can spare them.

To the Rev. Dr. Townley, &c. &c. &c.

REVEREND AND DEAR BROTHER,—Your letter of the 13th of June last to the Rev. William Case, and the annexed resolutions of your Missionary Committee of the 11th May, were submitted to the Conference at its late session; and after the general sense of the Conference was taken on the subjects embraced in your communication, the whole business was referred to the Missionary Board to communicate with you. Agreeably to the direction of the Board, we now transmit to you a copy of the resolutions adopted by them on these subjects.

By the annexed resolutions you will perceive, that due feelings of gratitude are entertained by the Board to our brethren in Great Britain, for their kind attentions to Messrs. Ryerson and Jones, and to your Committee for their expression of good will towards our interesting and flourishing Indian missions in Upper Canada. The Board cherish the highest respect and warmest affection for their brethren on the other side of the Atlantic, viewing the Methodists in England and in Upper Canada as two branches of the same family, and subjects of the same government.

But, considering all the circumstances of Mr. Jones's mission, and the apprehensions entertained that applications to the British public, from the Methodist Missionary Society in Upper Canada, would "involve your connexion in unpleasant party disputes," his deputation to England, as far as it relates to any applications to your contributors, has been regretted by the Board. You may rest assured that these circumstances were altogether unforeseen by our General Superintendent of Missions, when the deputation was determined upon. We should be sorry, indeed, to be even the innocent instru-

ments of doing any thing that would, in the least degree, disturb the peace of your connexion, or affect your missionary funds, so deservedly wanted throughout the vastly extended fields of your numerous and valuable missions.

It may, however, be remarked, by way of explanation, that Mr. Jones's mission to England was undertaken at the suggestion and recommendation of a number of intelligent and respectable *English* brethren, who stated their conviction that more guineas would be given in England, in aid of our Indian missions, than dollars in the United States, where a deputation from our Society was once sent, and was assisted by the Methodist brethren, in different cities and towns in that country, to make collections to the amount of several hundred pounds. Our conference being an independent connexion in a British province, our Indian missions established within the British territories, a preference was, of course, felt to making applications to the British public. And, lest any method should be adopted by our deputation which might interfere with your interests and operations, they were instructed to call upon your Committee for their advice. It is hoped, however, that, from the arrangements entered into between our Deputation and your Committee, Mr. Jones's mission may, upon the whole, have a favourable influence upon the funds of your own Society.—And no future deputation to England is contemplated by the Board, unless the measures adopted by your Committee should so far affect our missionary funds and operations in Canada, as to render further explanations and applications to the British public advisable and necessary.

The fourth, fifth, and sixth of the accompanying resolutions were entered into by the Board, in order to apprise your committee of the views and circumstances of our connexion relative to a part of the missionary field in Canada. The success of our Indian missions, considering the means expended, has, perhaps, not a parallel in the history of modern missions. This extraordinary and continued blessing of God upon the labours of our society, is considered a peculiar call of Providence to *continue* them in all our mission stations, and to all those tribes which our missionaries have visited. Indeed, the rapid progress of Methodism in Upper Canada generally appears to indicate most clearly, that our present ecclesiastical arrangements, whilst purely Wesleyan, are remarkably well adapted to the work of "spreading scriptural holiness throughout" the land, and that the abandonment of them would be stepping aside from the order of divine Providence.

By the *seventh* resolution annexed, you will perceive the readiness and anxiety of the Board to co-operate with your committee in their contemplated mission to Canada, as far as they can do so without "involving the connexion in unpleasant party disputes," and injuring our own missionary funds. There is little doubt but the funds of our own society can be increased to a sufficient sum to meet the wants of all the Indian tribes within the present boundaries of our Conference.

You will find an interesting account of the northern and western Indian tribes referred to by the Board, in the "two journals of the Rev. John West, A. M., late chaplain to The Hon. The Hudson's Bay Company." The most of these tribes speak the *Chippewa* tongue; and, it is believed, were evangelical missionaries sent among them, they would readily embrace Christianity. Two of our native Indian missionaries have visited some of these tribes, and were instrumental in the conversion of several of them. Our own society has had it in contemplation to commence missionary operations among them, but the prosecution of this work has been hitherto delayed for want of adequate means, and an effectual door opening almost simultaneously to the several Indian tribes in our own neighbourhoods, which has thus far employed all the funds we could command for missionary purposes.

It may, at the same time be remarked, that did our society possess the necessary funds, they could establish missions among even these tribes, at a far less expense, and to far greater advantage, than a society several thousand miles distant. Our society is located upon the ground, is well acquainted with

the agricultural and all the local circumstances of the country, the situation, prejudices, and customs of the Indians, the most efficient and economical plans of introducing the gospel among them, together with the arts and habits of civilization, and there are labourers in the employ of our society, whose past unexampled success proves them to be well qualified for the work. This, however, is only suggested for the consideration of your Committee.

It may be proper here, to observe, that the progress of Wesleyan Methodism, in Upper Canada, has been far more rapid than in any other Province of British North America, and that, without being any burden upon our brethren in Great Britain or elsewhere. A spirit of intellectual improvement and increasing weight of talent, a fervency of spirit and evangelical simplicity, are evidently keeping pace, in our connexion, with our increasing numbers and the improving state of society. Under the blessing of God, our societies are universally living in peace, and most of them are in a state of encouraging prosperity, and our missions are everywhere prosperous,—under these circumstances, when your committee become acquainted with the state of our affairs, we are persuaded they will see the unadvisedness of persisting in a measure, which, in its ultimate results, we cannot but view with fearful and melancholy apprehensions.

In pursuance of the instructions of your committee, the Rev. Mr. Turner has recently visited this place, and preached for us once. Mr. T.'s amiable deportment, during his residence at Kingston, has gained him a high place in the esteem and affections of our preachers generally, and has promoted a desirable feeling of brotherly love towards your connexion. His communications to individual members of the Board, on the present occasion, have not, however, been as definite and satisfactory as could have been wished.

We have understood that a station on the Grand River, among the Delaware and Cayuga tribes, has been represented to Mr. Turner as unoccupied, and as a suitable place for the establishment of your contemplated mission. It may, probably, have been unknown to the individual or individuals who may have given Mr. Turner this information, that these tribes are in the vicinity of one of our oldest mission stations; that our missionaries have preached to them regularly for a length of time; that, within the last four months, upwards of forty of them have been converted, and have joined our society, including several of the principal chiefs.

Upon the whole, it may be submitted to your committee, whether, under existing circumstances, your missionary funds could not be more advantageously applied to the furtherance of the work of human salvation, than in the establishment of a mission in this Province—other circumstances aside—at an expense far greater than would be necessary for the Methodist Missionary Society here, to impart the same doctrines, the same feelings, the same blessings, and effect the same improvements.

You are, perhaps, not apprised that there are many persons in this Province, who would rejoice to witness party disputes among the Methodists, and would recommend any measure, and do all in their power to create and foment them; rightly judging that, if they can but divide, they may eventually destroy them. But, we feel assured that your committee will not, knowingly, enter upon, or sanction, any measure that will “involve the Connexion in those party disputes,” which are alike destructive to the respectability, purity, and influence of Wesleyan Methodism, and the interests of true religion.

We trust your society and ours have a common object in view, and that the prayerful and persevering labours of both will be directed in those channels of usefulness and Christian philanthropy, which will tend to cement both connexions in strongest bonds of Christian affection, bring most glory to God, and most happiness to mankind. We are,

By order, and on behalf of, the Missionary Board,
Yours affectionately in the gospel of Jesus Christ,

JOHN RYERSON, *President.*
THOS. VAUX, *Secretary.*

York, U. C., Oct. 4th, 1831.

Rejoinder of the Wesleyan Missionary Committee in London to Wesleyan Missionary Board in Upper Canada.

London, 77, Hatton Garden, March 13th, 1832.

DEAR BRETHREN,—We embrace the opportunity of forwarding to you by the Rev. Robert Alder, the resolutions adopted by our Committee after deliberation on your resolutions, transmitted to us under date, York, October 4, 1831. We are, dear brethren, in the bonds of the gospel,

Yours, JAMES TOWNLEY, } *Secretaries to the*
 JOHN JAMES, } *Wes. Miss. Soc'y.*
 JOHN BEECHAM, }

To the Board of Managers of the Missionary Society of the M. E. Church in Upper Canada.

St. James's Chapel, Montreal, June 5, 1832.

My Dear Sir,—As I shall not be able to visit York until after the close of our district meeting, and shall be able to remain there but a very short time, I think it right to forward to you per post the enclosed resolutions, in order that you may have time to present them to the Board before I wait previously upon you.

I remain, yours truly,

R. ALDER,

Representative of the Wesleyan Miss. Society, and
Chairman of the Canadian District Meeting.

To Rev. John Ryerson,
President of Board of Managers, &c. &c. &c.

Resolutions of a Committee, held in London, February, 1832.

Certain resolutions of the Board of Missions connected with the Upper Canada Conference, objecting to the committee's employing missionaries in Upper Canada and among the Indians, having been read at the last meeting of the committee, and the treasurers and secretaries having been requested to confer with Messrs. Ryerson and Jones upon this subject, they report as follows:—

1. That with respect to the "understanding" alleged in the said resolutions to exist between the British and Canadian Conferences, that the missionaries of the former were to confine their labours to Lower Canada, and leave the Upper Province to the exclusive occupation of the Canadian conference, they informed Messrs. Ryerson and Jones that no such understanding could exist, inasmuch as the former compact between the United States General Conference ceased upon an independent conference being established for Upper Canada, and that when it was proposed by Mr. Capers to the British Conference of 1828, to make a similar agreement with the Canada Conference, it was *declined*.

2. That ever since that time the Committee have felt themselves fully at liberty to occupy any station in Upper Canada, to which they might have such a call as would warrant them to embrace it, with just regard to those general principles of respect to the useful application of funds, and the relation of any body of British emigrants, members of our societies, and attached to our discipline, to embrace it.

3. That the great change of circumstances as to Upper Canada since the agreement with the States General Conference, especially in respect of the immense number of settlers which have gone out from Great Britain and Ireland, and are still flowing into that Province in large numbers every year, was a decisive objection to the Committee's recommending it to the Conference

to confine its missions wholly to Lower Canada, or not to reinforce the mission they have had for some years in Kingston, or not to establish under such circumstances new missions in that Province.

4. That with respect to the principle urged upon the Committee in the resolutions of the Canada Board of Missions, "that the Methodists are one in every part of the world," could only be applicable in the sense of maintenance of fraternal affection, since a unity arising from the existence of but one form of Methodism in one province, is now out of the question; several distinct bodies of Methodists now existing in Upper Canada, who refuse to place themselves under the pastoral charge of the Canada Conference; and affording sufficient proof, that were our missionaries to be withheld entirely from that Province, a considerable number of independent bodies of Methodists would grow up.

5. That with respect to the Indian missions the original agreement with the United States General Conference did not in any respect relate to them, so as to exclude the Committee's endeavours to attempt their evangelization.—They were in fact never referred to in that agreement, but it has long been the Committee's intention to aid in this important work, in pursuance of a principle held sacred by the Committee to endeavour to connect with missions near European settlers, attempts to benefit the aboriginal heathens of those countries where they may locate themselves. This the Committee attempted in Labrador, in connection with the Newfoundland Mission in New Holland; and by the blessing of God very successfully in connexion with the South African colonies. The extent of the Committee's exertions, and the demands upon their funds, were the only reasons which caused them to delay their endeavours to evangelize the Indians in America.

6. That notwithstanding these views of the Committee, Messrs. Ryerson and Jones were informed that the Committee intend nothing as to Upper Canada contrary to that brotherly kindness which ought to exist between two kindred religious bodies; but that they shall not consider that principle at all contravened, should they fix missionaries in places of considerable population, although the Canada Conference may have societies in such places, the population being such as to afford reasonable ground to conclude that there is a sufficient sphere of labour for each, much less that it would be any infringement of the said principle should a mission be planted among settlers not yet provided with any religious ordinances.

7. That in the agreement between the United States General Conference and the British Conference, it was explicitly stated, that, should Methodism deteriorate in its form and spirit, or should any just political offence be given by their missionaries to the British Government, the British Conference should be at liberty again to employ its missionaries in Upper Canada. The deputation heard no explicit complaint in this respect against the United States Conference, nor did they charge the Canada Conference with either of such matters. This they were not called to enter into, inasmuch as no agreement to partition the two Canadas existed between the committee and the Canada Conference, and they were not therefore under any necessity of scrutinizing the fact; but that they must say with affection, but regret, that the publication of a paper expressly by the Canadian Conference, entering warmly and in the spirit of partizanship into the local politics of the Province, was not in the spirit or according to the practice of British Methodism, and contrary to that abstinence from such disputes which they enjoined upon their missionaries, a circumstance which had created prejudice against the acceptableness of the Canada brethren, with a part of the population of Canada. On these points a conversation of some length was held, at the close of which Messrs. Ryerson and Jones were assured of the kind regards of the committee, but were thus frankly put in possession of its views on the subject brought before it in the resolutions of the Canada Board of missions before mentioned.

Second Reply of the Wesleyan Missionary Board in Canada to the Wesleyan Missionary Committee in London.

EXTRACT OF THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD.

Certain resolutions of the committee of the Wesleyan Methodist Missionary Society in London, passed in February 1832, and transmitted by the Rev. Robert Alder, the Committee's Representative, having been laid before the Board on the evening of the 22d inst., and the Rev. Robert Alder, the Rev. John Hick, the Rev. Thomas Turner, and the Rev. John P. Hotherington being present by previous invitation; the resolutions of the committee in London enclosed by the Rev. Dr. Townley, and his accompanying letter to the Rev. William Case, dated June 13, 1831, the answer of the Board to the same, and the resolutions of the Wesleyan committee above referred to were read; after which a long, free, and friendly conversation took place between the members of the Board and the Missionary brethren, particularly Messrs. Alder and Hick, on the subjects of the several documents named above; at the conclusion of which the Board adjourned. At the ensuing adjourned meeting of the Board, held the evening of the 29th inst., the following resolutions were adopted.

1. That with respect to the first resolution of the Wesleyan Committee concerning the "understanding," &c., the resolution of the Board was founded on their understanding of the report made by the Rev. Mr. Capers, delegate from the American to the British Conference in 1823, which concludes thus:—"I did, however, distinctly understand the Committee as being of opinion that their Missionaries ought not to go into Upper Canada, unless either after some definite arrangement should have been concluded to that effect with the church there; or in case of its notorious inability to supply the people, or its departure from the doctrines, discipline, or economy which distinguish Methodism."

2. That as a large portion of the Canada Conference consist of Europeans; as the members of the Methodist Societies from Great Britain who have generally united with us, have uniformly expressed themselves satisfied with the economy of Methodism in Canada, and equally edified by our means of grace as in their native country; the influx of European emigration into this Province does not appear to the Board to render the organization of Methodist Societies distinct from those already established, expedient or advisable—and more especially as the Board considers the economy of Methodism in Canada to be as truly Wesleyan as that in Great Britain.

3. That the Board conceives the principle, "That the Methodists are one people in every part of the world," was understood by Mr. Wesley in a more extensive sense than merely "fraternal affection," as he cherished and taught "fraternal affection" between the Methodists, pious Baptists, Presbyterians, Moravians, &c., who were never represented by him as *one* with the Methodists in the sense that he declared "the Methodists are one people in all the world, and it is their full determination so to continue."

4. That with the exception of the Society under the care of the Wesleyan Committee, the parties (few and small in number and influence) in this Province who call themselves Methodists, and who are not under the superintendence of the Canada Conference, differ as widely in their government, economy, and usages, from the English, as from the Canada Connexion; nor is there any probability that the pastoral charge of the one would be more acceptable to them than that of the other. There is perhaps a greater variety of Methodists (so called) in Great Britain than in Canada. Hence the introduction of Missionaries distinct from those who are already labouring in connexion with the Canada Conference, is not likely to produce any greater uniformity in Methodism than now exists, and may lead to serious misunderstandings and party disputes.

5. That with respect to the seventh resolution of the committee, the Board

beg to refer the committee to Mr. Alder, with whom considerable conversation was held on the subject. It is extremely difficult, if not altogether impracticable, for any person or body of men, however wise and experienced, who are not acquainted with all the local circumstances of the country, to decide with certainty what part should in all cases be taken in matters in which the interests of religion are immediately concerned, but which may more remotely involve questions of political consideration, by a ministry or body of people who are not exotic, not missionary, or transient in their residence in the country, but who have grown up therein, and who have a common interest with its permanently settled inhabitants. Whatever may have been said or done respecting what the committee term "political disputes," the Board is satisfied that the spirit and practice of Methodism have been preserved and maintained unimpaired, and believes it prevails with an efficiency and to an extent in this country, in proportion to the population, not exceeded in the United States or Great Britain.

6. That the Board most cordially reciprocates the expressions of brotherly kindness and good will conveyed in the resolutions of the committee; and they will do what they can to aid Mr. Turner with native labourers in his contemplated mission to the St. Clair Indians, and will readily co-operate with the committee in cultivating the missionary field among the Indian tribes, as far as is consistent with the interest of their own missions.

7. That the establishment of two distinct connexions of Methodists in this Province, would, in the opinion of the Board, be productive of unpleasant feelings, litigation, and party disputes, to the discredit of Methodism and the great injury of religion; but that the energies of the English and Canada connexions, if combined, would, under the blessing of God, close the door against all collision and party feeling, and contribute greatly to the extension of the work, both amongst the white population and the Indian tribes.

8. That in order to prevent misunderstandings—to preserve peace and harmony in the Societies—to supply every part of the work throughout the Province—and to enlarge the field of missionary operations among the aboriginal inhabitants, the Board respectfully suggests to our conference at its approaching session, the propriety and importance of proposing such a coalition with the English Conference as will accomplish these objects.

9. That anticipating the adoption of such a measure by our conference as that recommended in the foregoing resolution; and appreciating the pure motives, friendly feelings, and sound judgment of the Rev. Robert Alder, Representative of the Wesleyan Missionary Society, and believing that an interview between him and the conference will be gratifying and satisfactory on both sides, and highly instrumental by the Divine blessing in promoting the cause of God and Methodism, the Board respectfully and earnestly invites Mr. Alder to attend the ensuing session of the conference, which will commence in Hallowell the 8th of August next. The Board, under the influence of the same feelings, makes a similar request to the Rev. John Hick, provided he can comply with it without too great a sacrifice of pastoral duty.

York, June 1st, 1832.

Rev. and dear Brethren,—We have the honour to transmit to your committee the enclosed resolutions of our Board of missions in answer to those of your committee of February, 1832, transmitted by the Rev. Mr. Alder, whose interesting talents, christian candour, and amiable manners, have won much upon the kindly feelings and good wishes of all among us who have enjoyed the pleasure of his society.

You will perceive that the Board cannot view some points in the same light with your committee; but that, nevertheless, they are most anxious to recommend and concur in any measures that may promote the harmony of Methodism and the interests of religion; and with this view they have solicited Mr. Alder to remain in the Province until our ensuing annual conference. On the subject of the *seventh* resolution the Board have, properly speaking, no autho-

rity to act or decide; and it was for the purpose of putting your committee into early possession of their views of this subject, which has been long and largely talked of amongst our preachers and people, that they embrace this opportunity of expressing them, hoping at the same time that it might prepare the way for the accomplishment of the highly interesting and important objects proposed. It is believed there will be very little diversity of opinion in our conference in regard to a measure of this kind. And if arrangements can be agreed upon by which a connexion be established between the British and Canada conferences analogous to that which exists between the English and Irish conferences, we doubt not but it will be extensively instrumental in advancing the work of God in the Provinces. None of the circumstantial peculiarities of Methodism in Great Britain and Canada (which we think are fewer and smaller than have been supposed) could form any serious objection on our part, since we maintain that Methodism, in all its essential principles and regulations, is the same in every part of the world.

We beg to present to you and your committee our own best wishes for your personal welfare, and your success in the responsible and extensive work placed under your control; and we fervently pray God to give your conference and ours a right judgment in all things, and overrule every deliberation and decision for the promotion of his glory and the best interests of mankind.

We are, Brethren, yours in the bonds of the Gospel,

JOHN RYERSON, *President.*

THOMAS VAUX, *Secretary.*

To the Rev. James Townley, John James, James Becham,
Secs. London, W. M. S.

No. 11.

Articles of Union between the Wesleyan Conference in England and the Conference of the Wesleyan Methodist Church in Canada.

The English Wesleyan Conference, concurring in a communication of the Canadian Conference, and deprecating the evils which might arise from collision, and believing that the cause of religion generally, and the interests of Methodism in particular, would, under the blessing of God, be greatly promoted by the united exertions of the two Connexions; considering also, that the two bodies concur in holding the doctrines of Methodism as contained in the Notes of Mr. Wesley on the New Testament, and in his four volumes of Sermons, do agree in the adoption of the following Resolutions:—

1st. That such a union between the English and Canadian connexions, as shall preserve inviolate the rights and privileges of the Canadian preachers and societies on the one hand, and, on the other, shall secure the funds of the English Conference against any claims on the part of the Canadian preachers, is highly important and desirable.

2nd. That, [as proposed in the second and third resolutions of the Canadian Conference] in order to effect this object, the Discipline, Economy, and form of church government in general of the Wesleyan Methodists in England be introduced into the societies in Upper Canada, and that in particular an annual Presidency be adopted.*

3rd. That the usages of the English Conference, in reference to the probation, examination, and admission of candidates into the Itinerant Ministry, be adopted.

* This is understood both by the Canadian Conference and the Representatives from the British Conference to refer to no other modifications in the economy of Methodism in Upper Canada, than those which have taken place at this Conference, and that the Canadian Book of Discipline has heretofore provided for.

4th. That Preachers who have travelled the usual term of probation, and are accepted by the Canadian Conference, shall be ordained by the imposition of the hands of the President, and of three or more of the Senior Preachers, according to the form contained in Mr. Wesley's "Sunday morning service of the Methodists," by which the Wesleyan Missionaries in England are ordained, and which is the same as the form of ordaining Elders in the Discipline of the Canadian Conference.

5th. That the English Conference shall have authority to send from year to year, one of its own body to preside over the Canadian Conference; but the same person shall not be appointed oftener than once in four years, unless at the request of the Canadian Conference.—When the English Conference does not send a President from England, the Canadian conference shall, on its assembling, choose one of its own members.

The proposal of the Canadian conference is understood to include, as a matter of course, that the President of the conference shall exercise the same functions generally as the present general Superintendent now actually exercises; he shall not, however, have authority to appoint any Preacher to any circuit or station, contrary to the counsel and advice of a majority of the Chairmen of Districts or Presiding Elders, associated with him as a Stationing committee.

6th. That the Missions among the Indian tribes and destitute settlers which are now, or may be hereafter, established in Upper Canada, shall be regarded as Missions of the English Wesleyan Missionary Society under the following regulations:—

First,—The Parent committee in London shall determine the amount to be applied annually to the support and extension of the Missions; and this sum shall be distributed by a committee consisting of the President, General Superintendent of the Missions, the chairmen of districts, and seven other persons appointed by the Canadian conference. A standing Board or committee, consisting of an equal number of Preachers and Laymen, shall moreover be appointed as heretofore at every conference, which, during the year, shall have authority, in concurrence with the General Superintendent of Missions, to apply any monies granted by the parent committee, and not distributed by the conference, in establishing new missions among the heathen, and otherwise promoting the missionary work.

Second,—The Methodist Missionary Society in Upper Canada shall be auxiliary to the English Wesleyan Missionary Society, and the monies raised by it shall be paid into the funds of the Parent Society.

Third,—The Missionaries shall be stationed at the Canada conference in the same way as the other preachers; with this proviso, however, that the General Superintendent of Missions shall be associated with the President and chairmen of districts in their appointment.

Fourth,—All the preachers who may be sent from this country into the work in Upper Canada, shall be members of the Canadian conference, and shall be placed under the same discipline, and be entitled to the same rights and privileges as the native preachers.*

Fifth,—Instead of having the annual stations of the missionaries sent home to the English Missionary committee and conference for their "sanction," as is the case with our missions generally, and as the Canadian conference have proposed, the English conference shall appoint, and the parent committee shall meet the expense of supporting a general superintendent of missions; who, as the agent of the committee, shall have the same superintendence of the mission stations, as the chairmen of districts or presiding elders exercise over the circuits in their respective districts, and shall pay the missionaries their allowance as determined by the conference missionary committee on the same scale as the Canadian book of Discipline lays down for the preachers on the regular

* The understanding of this article is that the Canadian Conference shall employ such young men in Upper Canada as they may judge are called of God, into the itinerant work; but should not a sufficient number be found in Upper Canada properly qualified, the British Conference will send out as many young men from England as may be requested by the Canadian Conference.

circuits :—but who, being at the same time recognised as a member of the Canadian conference, shall be accountable to it in regard of his religious and moral conduct. This General Superintendent of missions representing the parent committee in the Canadian conference, and in the stationing and missionary committees, the appointments of the missionaries at the conference shall be final.

7th,—That the Canadian conference in legislating for its own members, or the connexion at large, shall not at any time make any regulation which shall infringe these articles of agreement between the two conferences.

Signed by order and on behalf of the Conference.

RICHARD TREFFRY, *President*,

EDMOND GRINDROD, *Secretary*.

Manchester, August 7, 1833.

Resolved,—That the Canadian Conference cordially concurs in the resolutions of the British Conference, dated, "Manchester, August 7, 1833," as the basis of union between the two Conferences.

EGERTON RYERSON, *Secretary*.

York, U. C., October 2, 1833.

No. 12.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE WESLEYAN CONFERENCE IN ENGLAND.

Letter from the Rev. Dr. Hannah to the Representatives of the Canada Conference.

8, Myddleton Square,

Pentonville, London, Aug. 25, 1840.

MY DEAR SIRS,—The Special Committee on Canadian affairs, of which you have a list in the paper which accompanies this, appointed a Sub-Committee from among themselves to meet and confer with you. That Sub-Committee consists of the President and Secretary of the Conference, the Missionary Secretaries, and the Rev. Messrs. Reece, Atherton, Lord, Stinson, Richey, Scott, Grindrod, T. Jackson, Keeling, Haswell, and Bowers. It was directed, at the late meeting of the Special Committee in Manchester, on Wednesday last, that this Sub-Committee should meet at 77, Hatton Garden, London, on Thursday, September 3rd, at 10 o'clock in the forenoon, *for the particular purpose of having a free and friendly conversation with you*. I was instructed to give you notice of this, on my return to town, and to invite you to attend; and I would earnestly hope that you may be able so to arrange your plans as to remain two or three days longer in London than you had previously intended. Officially and personally, I would venture to press this; because it seems to me to be of considerable importance to the right settlement of the affairs which have lately engaged so much of our serious and anxious attention.

I am, my dear Sirs,

Yours very respectfully and truly,

JOHN HANNAH.

Rev. Egerton Ryerson, and Rev. William Ryerson.

Newcastle-upon-Tyne, August, 1840.

Proceedings and Decision of the Conference on Matters relating to the Union between the British Conference and the Upper Canada Conference, and to our Missions in Upper Canada.

The Conference last year appointed a Special Committee to decide finally in all matters relating to the Union existing between the British Conference and the Upper Canada Conference, and to our Indian Missions in Upper Canada. A large Committee was also this year appointed by the Conference, to investigate the proceedings of the aforesaid Committee of last year,—to consider the Resolutions which were adopted by the Upper Canada Conference of 1840, and to receive the communications of the Rev. Egerton Ryerson and Rev. William Ryerson, the representatives deputed by the Upper Canada Conference to attend the British Conference. The Committee last named sat several days, and at length presented a copious report to the Conference, which report received a few verbal alterations and additions, and on the whole of which, as thus amended, the decision of the Conference was then given.

I. THE REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE.

During the long and careful examination of the important subjects referred to the Committee, various documents were read or largely quoted, and oral testimonies received, comprising the following Articles :

1. Dr. Alder's Statement of the Proceedings of the Committee appointed by the British Conference for the affairs of Upper Canada in 1839.

2. Articles of Union between the British Conference and the Conference of Upper Canada, drawn up in 1833.

3. The Rev. John Beecham's statements and explanations in illustration of the aforesaid Articles of Union.

4. The Rev. George Marsden's explanatory statement respecting the note appended by the Upper Canada Conference of 1833, to the 5th clause of the 6th Article of Union, and the first payment of the government grant for our Missions in Upper Canada.

5. Statements of the Rev. Edmund Grindrod, Rev. William Lord, and Rev. Joseph Stinson, who have been Presidents of the Upper Canada Conference ; and also of the Rev. Matthew Richey.

6. Letter from the Rev. Egerton Ryerson to Dr. Alder in 1834.

7. Extracts from the Minutes of the Upper Canada Conference, held at Toronto in 1837, on Government Grants for Religious purposes, involving principles which might have been pleaded by the Government as a reason for withholding from the Wesleyan Missionary Society the grant pledged to that Society from the Casual and Territorial Revenue for the support and extension of our Missions amongst the Indians and destitute settlers in Upper Canada, and which, in point of fact, did induce the local Government to decline for a time to renew, in conformity with the instructions of the Secretary of State for the Colonies, the payment of the suspended grant.

8. Extracts from Letters of the Rev. Joseph Stinson, under the dates of October and November, 1838, and January, 1839, showing that the peace of our Societies in Canada was disturbed through an habitual and zealous interference with secular and party politics by the Christian Guardian ; which paper, being the avowed and official organ of the Upper Canada Conference, virtually involved the British Conference, during the subsisting union, in a common responsibility as to principles and consistency.

9. Dr. Alder's letter to the Rev. Joseph Stinson, dated London, January 14th, 1839, on the subjects referred to in the above named Letters of Mr. Stinson.

10. Letter of the Secretaries of the Wesleyan Missionary Society to the Lieutenant Governor, Sir George Arthur, dated London, February 8th, 1839, announcing the mission of Dr. Alder to our Societies in British North America, and to the Upper Canada Conference, disclaiming, on the part of the Wesleyan Missionary Society, all participation in the responsibility attached to certain publications on questions then agitated in Canada, and expressing their anxiety to maintain the honour and consistency of our religious character, and to preserve "all the Societies, with whom they are in any degree identified, in habits of loyalty and peace, and of exclusive devotedness, in their collective and ecclesiastical relations, to the great work of promoting the spiritual and eternal interests of mankind."

11. Letter of the President of the British Conference, the Rev. Thomas Jackson, to the Rev. Egerton Ryerson, complaining of his official advocacy of principles in the Christian Guardian inconsistent with, and opposed to, the principles held and often declared by the British Conference.

12. Extracts from the Minutes of the Upper Canada Conference held at Hamilton in June, 1839, containing the settlements of matters in dispute up to that period, and an amicable arrangement for the future.

13. Extracts from the Christian Guardian on the same subjects.

14. Dr. Alder's Letter to the Rev. Joseph Stinson, dated New York, October 9th, 1839.

15. Extracts from the letters of the Rev. Joseph Stinson and Rev. Matthew Richey to Dr. Alder 1839 and 1840.

16. Memorial addressed to the Governor-General by the Rev. Joseph Stinson, President of the Upper Canada Conference, and Superintendent of our Missions in Upper Canada, and by the Rev. Matthew Richey, Superintendent of Toronto.

17. Letter to Dr. Alder from Mr. Vernon Smith, M. P., Under Secretary of State for the Colonies, dated Downing Street, 1840, inclosing, by order of Lord John Russell, an important communication of the Rev. Egerton Ryerson's to the Governor-General, and which Mr. Vernon Smith's letter subscribes as respecting the grant to the Wesleyan Missionary Society.

18. Dr. Alder's letter to the Right Honourable Lord John Russell, Her Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for the Colonies, in reply to Mr. Vernon Smith's communication.

19. Resolutions of the Committee appointed by the British Conference of 1839, to decide finally in all matters relating to the Union existing between the British Conference and the Upper Canada Conference, and to our Indian Missions in Upper Canada, held at 77, Hatton Garden, London, on Wednesday April 29th, 1840; which Resolutions specify the three distinct allegations, or matters of complaint, to which reference is made in the Resolutions of this Committee hereinafter inserted (see Resolution I.)

20. Correspondence of the Rev. Egerton Ryerson with the Governor-General of British North America.

21. Resolution on Government grants for religious purposes submitted by Dr. Alder to the Upper Canada Conference at Hamilton, in 1839.

22. Address of the Upper Canada Conference, held at Belleville in June 1840, to the British Conference.

23. Resolutions, in accordance with the views of the British Conference, which were proposed to the Upper Canada Conference in 1840, and negatived by a large majority.

24. Resolutions of the Upper Canada Conference in 1840, carried by a large majority, after those last mentioned were negatived.

25. Report of the Committee on British Canadian affairs, held at Newcastle-upon-Tyne, on Friday Evening, July 31st, 1840.

In connexion with the recital or quotation of the preceding Documents, the Rev. Egerton Ryerson and Rev. William Ryerson, as representatives of the Upper Canada Conference, were also heard at very great length, and every

other method was used, at several successive meetings, to obtain a full exposition of the case, after all which, the Committee agreed to recommend the following Resolutions to the Conference.

I. That the three Resolutions, or matters of complaint, contained in the Resolutions of the Committee on Canadian affairs, at their meeting on the 29th of April last, and forwarded by that Committee to the Upper Canada Conference, are regarded as fully proved; and that after seriously considering the Explanations and Defence of the Rev. Egerton Ryerson and Rev. William Ryerson, the representatives of the Upper Canada Conference, on these points, and giving them the full weight to which they might be deemed to be entitled, the Committee are decidedly of opinion that the representatives of the Upper Canada Conference have entirely failed to establish a justification; inasmuch as it appears that, notwithstanding all they have stated and explained, there existed,

1. A practical superseding of the Rev. Joseph Stinson as President, by communicating with the Governor-General, separately and without his knowledge, and by acting without him, and without the Committee of the Upper Canada Conference,—of which committee Mr. Stinson was a member, and chairman *ex officio* on matters affecting the permanency of the Government grant to the Wesleyan Missionary Society.

2. A violation of the obligations arising from the union, in not opposing but rather countenancing the payment of our grant in a certain contingency, not to us, but to the Upper Canada Conference, for other and different purposes.

3. The decidedly and prominently political character of the Christian Guardian, in violation of pledges given to us and to the Upper Canada Conference, from 1833 to 1839.

II. That, after a most careful examination of the complicated and difficult subjects which have engaged the attention of the Committee appointed by the British Conference of 1839 to decide finally in all matters relating to the union existing between the British Conference and the Upper Canada Conference, and to our Indian missions in Upper Canada; and after having, in the course of a very protracted discussion, had abundant proof of the wisdom, care, and kindness which the aforesaid Committee have manifested in relation to the affairs of Upper Canada, the present Committee are unanimously of opinion, that the members of the Committee in Upper Canada affairs, particularly in the resolutions adopted at their meeting in London, on Wednesday, April 29, 1840, and transmitted to the Upper Canada Conference, have strictly adhered to those great principles which have always guided the Wesleyan body, and that they are therefore entitled to the thanks of the Conference for the important services which they have rendered to the common cause of Wesleyan Methodism.

III. After a close consideration of the resolutions of the Upper Canada Conference of 1840, in answer to the resolutions of our Committee, on Upper Canada affairs, at their meeting on April 29, 1840, it was Resolved—

1. That this Committee is most happy to perceive that one of these resolutions, which determines that the Christian Guardian shall cease to be a political paper, and shall be confined to purely religious and literary subjects and articles of religious intelligence, is to that extent satisfactory; but that the unqualified reservation of the "Clergy Reserve Question"—a reservation already so construed and abused as to be pleaded in justification of an almost unlimited discussion of great and general principles on Ecclesiastical Polity, held sacred by this body, and the absence of any adequate security for a more faithful observance of this Resolution than has been maintained with respect to similar pledges repeatedly given from 1833 to 1839, in connexion with the fact that a direct negative was simultaneously given to another series of resolutions, which would have been much more explicit and satisfactory on the several subjects referred to, are circumstances which the Committee deeply regret, and cannot but regard with distrust and disapprobation.

2. That on the other important topics embraced in the Resolutions of our Committee on Upper Canada affairs, dated April 29, 1840, the Resolutions of the last Upper Canada Conference appear rather to imply an acquiescence in the evils complained of, and an official adoption of them, than a cordial determination to prevent their future recurrence by substantial and efficient measures, and seem to evince that there is a decided difference between the two Conferences on the construction of the Articles of Union, in reference to fundamental principles essential to the good working of the Union, and which the Committee are of opinion that the British Conference cannot abandon, without compromising its own consistency and reputation; inasmuch as it cannot safely be identified in views and responsibility with any body, however respected, over whose public proceedings it is denied the right and power of exerting any official influence, so as to secure a reasonable and necessary co-ordinate but efficient direction, during the continuance of the Union.

IV. That, in the judgment of this Committee, nothing has occurred, in the whole course of these negotiations, to shake the confidence of the Conference in the Rev. Joseph Stinson and the Rev. Matthew Richey; and that the members of the Committee cannot but express their hearty esteem and approbation of the ability, fidelity, and diligence with which these respected brethren have performed the duties officially confided to them.

V. That notwithstanding the grounds of grievance and complaint on which the Committee have felt it to be their duty to express so strong an opinion, they are aware of the desirableness of maintaining the existing union between the two bodies, for reasons which relate to the general interests of our common Christianity, and to the continued connexion of the Province with the Mother Country. Yet, in their judgment, that union can be advantageously maintained only by the strict and undeviating adherence of our Upper Canada brethren to the following principles and regulations:—

1. That the continuation of the Government grant to the Wesleyan Missionary Society, be cordially assented to, and supported by, our Upper Canadian brethren, even if its payment should be ultimately transferred, as proposed in the Clergy Reserve Bill, lately passed by the Imperial Parliament, from the casual and territorial revenue on which it is now placed, to the Clergy Reserve Fund, in that Province; and that, as it appears that the payment of the grant has actually been again suspended, and is at present withheld, to the great inconvenience and embarrassment of our missions in Upper Canada, the Rev. Egerton Ryerson shall address a letter to Lord John Russell, disclaiming any intention or wish to deprive the Wesleyan Missionary Society of the grant of £700 per annum, secured to that Society as a fixed charge for missionary purposes in Upper Canada, requesting that its regular payment may be continued; and assuring his lordship that any other construction which may have been put upon his letter to the Governor in Chief, was founded in a misapprehension of his meaning.

2. That the Christian Guardian, or whatever newspaper or periodical may, in future, be recognized as the official organ of the Upper Canadian Conference, shall entirely abstain from all party political reasonings and discussions, confining its expressions of opinion to religious and literary topics.

3. That such official organ admit and maintain all the acknowledged principles of the Wesleyan Methodist connexion; and that, in seeking for a right understanding on this point, the committee have especial reference to that principle of our body which asserts it to be the duty of civil governments to employ their influence, and a portion of their resources, for the support of the Christian religion.

The Committee recommend, in conclusion, that the Conference now remit the whole affair to the management of a special committee, whose duty it shall be to draw up a statement, in a more detailed manner, of the points on which full satisfaction will be expected from the Conference of Upper Canada, and to make such a report of the resolutions of that body thereupon, as may enable

our next Conference, assembling in Manchester, to determine finally, the course which, in reference to this union, it may then appear proper to adopt in the settlement of the whole affair.

II. THE DECISION OF THE CONFERENCE.

The report above inserted was presented to the Conference, and read in the hearing of the Revs. E. Ryerson and W. Ryerson, representatives of the Upper Canada Conference. They desired a copy of it, which was accordingly handed to them; and they retired to examine its several parts. When they returned, they were again heard at length, and mutual explanations were made on several points to which they demurred. In the end, they frankly and explicitly declared it as their opinion, that the Upper Canada Conference, of which they are the representatives, would never be induced to accede to the views which are contained in the aforesaid report, and concerning which such serious misunderstandings have arisen; and, that the maintenance of such views, on the part of this body, would be regarded by the Canada Conference as a virtual dissolution of the union. Upon hearing this, the Conference was reluctantly led to the conviction, that a continuation of the more intimate connexion, established by the articles of 1833, is quite impracticable. The Conference could not overlook the fact, that the pacific resolutions, which had already been proposed to the Upper Canada Conference of 1840, by some of its members, were negatived by a large majority; and that, from the statements of the Rev. Egerton and Rev. William Ryerson, just made, the same disposition evidently remains, and clearly precludes a further perpetuation of the union. But the Conference wishes to express its paternal and affectionate feelings towards the Upper Canadian brethren, whose continued and increasing prosperity in the enjoyment of "all spiritual blessings," and in the extension of all beneficial spiritual influence, it earnestly desires; and, while the relation subsisting between the two Conferences may, henceforth, be simply that which marks two independent sections of the great Methodist family, it is devoutly hoped, and implored at the hands of our most merciful God, that they, and all the other parts of the same family, may always preserve towards each other such sentiments of sincere Christian friendship as become the portions of the church of Christ which agree in many points of doctrine and discipline, closely bearing, as they firmly believe, on the best interests of mankind. And, in order that every arrangement may be made in the kindest and most effectual manner, the Conference deems it right to confide the whole affair to a Special Committee, who shall be invested with full authority to act, during this time and the next Conference in Manchester, in all matters connected with this subject, and especially to take measures, in conjunction with our general Missionary Committee, for the future prosecution of our work in the United Province of Canada, and of our missions among the Aborigines and destitute settlers;—with power also to add to their number, and to appoint, from among themselves, such sub-committees as may be thought advisable. It is likewise recommended that the Rev. Egerton Ryerson and the Rev. William Ryerson be invited to attend the said Committee, or any sub-committee or deputation which may be appointed by it, with a design to render every plan and disposition of affairs as amicable as possible. On the whole subject, therefore, the Conference resolves, **UNANIMOUSLY** ;—

I. That the first four resolutions contained in the preceding report of the Committee, as those resolutions are revised and amended, be received and adopted by the Conference.

II. That as, for the reasons above suggested, a perpetuation of the union between the British and Upper Canadian Conferences is judged to be impracticable, the fifth resolution contained in the aforesaid report, under all the circumstances in which the subject is now presented for the decision of the Conference, cannot be received and adopted; but that the following Committee be

appointed with all the powers already mentioned, to take the most judicious and Christian measures, in conjunction with the Rev. Egerton Ryerson and Rev. William Ryerson, as representatives of the Upper Canadian Conference, that the formal dissolution of the union may not be accompanied with any thing that might produce embittered feelings, or injure mutual charity: viz. The President and Secretary of the Conference, the Rev. Messrs. Richard Reece, Richard Trefry, Thomas Jackson, John Scott, John P. Haswell, Edmund Grindrod, Thomas Galland, James Dixon, Joseph Taylor, Peter McOwan, Matthew Richey, Joseph Stinson, George Marsden, William Lord, Robert Wood, Barnard Slater, John Rigg, William Bennet, William M. Bunting, John Davis, Sen., John Bowers, William Atherton, Richard Waddy, Isaac Keeling, Timothy Ingle, John Mason, Jun., Samuel Jackson, William Vevers, Joseph Fowler, William Barton, Francis A. West, Samuel D. Waddy, together with the Missionary Secretaries.

III. That the above-named Committee shall hold its first meeting in Manchester on Wednesday, August 19th next, and its subsequent meetings as may be found convenient or necessary.

JOHN HANNAH, *Secretary.*

Letter from the Representatives of the Wesleyan Conference in Canada, to the Rev. Dr. Hannah, Secretary, in reference to the proceedings of the British Conference on Canadian Affairs.

22, Cecil Street, London, August 29, 1840.

REV. AND DEAR SIR,—We have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 25th instant, enclosing the "Proceedings and Decision of the Conference on matters relating to the Union between the British Conference, and to the Missions in Upper Canada," and informing us of the appointment of a Sub-Committee "for the particular purpose of having a free and friendly conversation" with us on matters pending between the Wesleyan connexions in England and in Upper Canada.

We beg most cordially to reciprocate the expressions of personal kindness contained in your letter, and to assure you that no differences on public grounds shall be allowed to suspend, on our part, the offices of private friendship, or prevent the ingenuous exercise of those courtesies and duties which arise from our religious and official relations.

We regret that it is not in our power to meet your Sub-committee, as we have taken and paid our passage on board of the "British Queen," which departs for New York on the 1st of September. We stated to several of the members of the Committee at Newcastle, that we intended to embark for America by the 1st of September. We, however, delayed taking our passage for several days, in hopes of hearing from you. Mr. Fowler, Superintendent of Newcastle, and Mr. Lord, informed us the evening before we left Newcastle, that we would receive an official communication on the subject of our mission, by Wednesday, the 19th instant. We deferred until the end of the week—the latest moment allowed in order to secure comfortable berths—before we engaged our passage. But we know not what advantage could arise from our meeting your Sub-committee, as we have no authority to assent to any dissolution of the Union between the conferences in England and in Canada, much less to consent to, or acquiesce in, your establishing an interest in Upper Canada, distinct from that of the Wesleyan Methodist Church in that province. Of course the Missionary committee are responsible for all demands in connexion with the Missions in Upper Canada, up to the period of your secession from the Union. The accounts must be arranged and settled with the Missionary Board of the Canada Conference.

We now proceed to state in writing those views respecting the "Proceedings and Decision" of your conference, which we should have communicated verbally had we been able to meet your Sub-committee. But previously to our doing so, we beg to make a few preliminary remarks.

1. Let it be recollected first, that the Constitution and Rules of the Wesleyan Body in Canada are not scattered over several large octavo volumes of Minutes of Conference, to be interpreted to the Societies by the Superintendents of circuits, and by the conference in doubtful questions, as is the case in England; but are embodied in a small book entitled "Doctrines and Discipline of the Wesleyan Methodist Church in Canada;" defining the powers of the conference, the objects, powers, and duties, of every official meeting and office in the church. 2. That previously to the union with the conference in England, the Connexion in Canada was an *independent* body, under the church organization referred to, possessing the discretionary and absolute management of its own affairs. 3. That it has always retained all its previous power of self control—all its rights and privileges,—which were not conceded to the conference in England in the *Articles of Union*. 4. That the articles of Union required and received the assent of the two conferences, and can *only be dissolved by their mutual consent*, unless in case of a hitherto unknown and very improbable exigency. The relinquishment of the Articles of Union, therefore, by either party, without the consent of the other, involves that party in the responsibility, as well as the consequences, of a *secession* from the other body in the country where it takes place. 5. That in ascertaining the import of the Articles of the Union—and, consequently, to judge of the violation of them—we are to examine the Articles themselves, and judge of their nature and provisions, from the grammatical and common sense meaning of the language which they contain, in connexion with the usages to which they refer. It is one of the first principles of common and civil law, that "no man can take advantage of his own wrongs"—a principle which would be prostrated in the dust were we to admit the interpretations of Mr. Beecham, or the paraphrases of Dr. Alder, as the Articles of Union between the Wesleyan Conferences in England and in Canada.

We may further observe, that the letter and spirit of the resolutions and address of the Canada Conference of June last, evince a strong desire on the part of that body to maintain the Articles of the Union inviolate; that this was the great object of our expensive and painful mission to England; and that the assumption of vast additional powers on the part of the conference in England, and the prescribing of new conditions as the only terms of perpetuating the Union—assumptions and conditions to which the Canada Conference have most solemnly objected—and the responsibility of the dissolution of the Union, in consequence of a non-compliance of ourselves and the conference we represent with those recent assumptions and new conditions, rest entirely with your Conference.

We now advance to a brief examination of the "Proceedings and Decision" of your Conference.

1. We came to England in accordance with the suggestion of the committee of your conference on Canadian affairs, which stated, that "If the Canadian conference should deem it to be its duty to send a Representative to the next British conference for the purpose of offering any explanations or of making proposals with a view of perpetuating the Union; or should that be found impracticable, for the purpose of making such arrangements as may prevent unseemly and unchristian collisions between members of two divisions of the same great family, the Committee assure the Canadian Conference, that such Representative will be received with cordial affection by the British Conference, and that every attention will be paid to his statements and representations." The kind and manner of our reception is familiar to you; we shall merely say, it was to us a new thing in Methodism; and that, up to the present moment, neither of us has been favoured with the honour or the

courtesy of a salutation either from Dr. Bunting, or the President of your conference, or any of the leading official members, with a few exceptions. If a Representative of your conference to Canada, or to the United States, had never even been saluted by a shake of the hand or a nod of the head, on the part of the presiding Officers of the conferences in those countries, we question whether he could state with truth, that he had been "received with cordial affection."* Into further details as to our official reception we will not enter; for many expressions of kindness and attention on the part of individual members of your conference we cherish a grateful remembrance, and desire to record our heartfelt acknowledgments, especially for the unwearied and affectionate attentions of the Rev. W. Lord, late President of the Canada Conference.

2. It is probably known to you, that by notes to the President, and otherwise, we urged the early consideration of the subject of our mission, but that several days elapsed before even the appointment of a committee was proposed; that we objected to the reference of the Canadian address and resolutions to a committee before they were read and discussed in conference, as they were addressed to the *British Conference*, and embodied an appeal from the proceedings of its own committee; that our objections were overruled, with the assurance that we should have an opportunity of stating fully the whole matter to the conference.† It will also appear by the minutes of your conference,

(Notes from the London Edition.)

* *Note by E. Ryerson.*—It is with extreme pain and regret that I have deemed it just and expedient to join in these remarks, as, on two former occasions, when representing the Canadian Conference in England, I received all the attentions that brotherly kindness, intelligence, and generosity, could bestow. I confess that although, for obvious reasons, I did not anticipate an equally flattering reception on the present occasion, I did suppose that the usual civilities would be extended to a senior and confessedly unoffending brother; as a stranger, an accredited Representative of a co-ordinate branch of the great Wesleyan family, a brother greatly beloved and honoured by his brethren in his native country. The Representatives of the British Conference have always been treated in Canada with every mark of respect and distinction. When Dr. Alder was in Canada, in 1839, he was not sent to a solitary boarding-house, as a leper, but was most courteously entertained by a respectable Methodist family, and treated with every possible attention by the Conference, though the well known and avowed objects of his mission were more repugnant to the feelings and interests of the Connexion in Canada, than the mission of the Canadian Representatives could be to the intelligent views of the Wesleyan body in England. On calm review and mature reflection, I am persuaded, the authorities of the British Conference will regret their repulsive treatment of the Representatives of the Canada Conference. It was undignified and new in Methodism; and cannot bear examination in any point of view. But I cherish no other than feelings of regret at the occurrence of such an event in the history of Methodist Conferences. It shall not cool the ardour of my affection for the many venerable members of the Conference with whom I have had the privilege of a slight acquaintance; nor shall it lower my estimate of a body of ministers whose epistolary works of faith and labours of love are read and known of all men at home and abroad.

† The morning after the appointment of the committee on Canadian affairs, one of the Canadian representatives addressed the following note to the Rev. Dr. Bunting:—

"Friday Morning, August 7, 1840.

"REV. SIR.—As assurance has been given by the President, and as it is understood that an opportunity will be afforded us of stating all the facts of the Canadian affair, as we understand and view it, to the Conference, and as it is our required duty and intention to do so, whether the committee report in favour of continuing the union with the Canada Conference or not, I take the liberty of submitting whether you do not think it will be a great saving of time and labour, for the statements on both sides to be made to the Conference before the committee on Canadian affairs meets?

"If the statements are first made to the committee, we shall be under the necessity of making them a second time, with equal minuteness, in the Conference; whereas, if they are first made in the Conference, they need not be repeated in the committee.

"After the statements on both sides shall have been made to the Conference, the committee can proceed, with comparatively little further discussion or delay, to prepare such resolutions as may be judged expedient for the final decision of the Conference.

"I merely submit this for your consideration. The Conference, it is probable, will not sit while the committee is sitting. It will occupy no more time to state the facts to the Conference than to the committee; but it is immaterial to us which course is pur-

that the committee thus appointed on Canadian affairs did not meet until Saturday, the 8th of August, eleven days after the commencement of the session, and within three days of the then anticipated close of it. It must likewise be in your recollection, that when, in Committee, we remonstrated against being interrupted at almost every stage of our remarks, stating that we had not in any one instance interrupted Dr. Alder in his four hours' statement, or Mr. Stinson in his statement in support of the statements made by Dr. Alder, we were informed by Dr. Bunting, in reply, that such was your mode of proceeding in committees—that any statement was liable to be objected to the moment it was made, and explanation demanded at any time—that no credit was due to either of us for not having interrupted Dr. Alder or Mr. Stinson, as we might have done so if we had chosen; that when we came to speak in conference we could proceed without interruption till we had concluded. You are furthermore aware, that the affair was not reported to the conference until Thursday evening, the 13th instant, and not taken up until the following day, a few hours before the close of the session; when, out of upwards of three hundred members who had attended the conference, the greatest number present during the consideration of the Canadian business was *Seventy-two* (a less number than there are members of the Canada conference), the other two hundred or two hundred and fifty preachers having left conference for their circuits; that *then* we were told, that as so much time had been occupied with the investigation of the subject in committee, and as there was scarcely a preacher present who was not either a member of the committee, or had not witnessed its proceedings, the further discussion of the subject in conference was inadmissible as well as unnecessary; and that our remarks must therefore be confined to the expression of our views respecting the Report of the committee.

3. So much as to the *mode* of your Conference proceeding in this affair. We have felt it our duty to make these brief references to it, as it is several times alluded to in the resolutions which you have enclosed. In regard to the resolutions themselves, we cannot but express, in the first place, our surprise and regret at the manner in which the statements reported to have been made, and the papers and documents stated to have been read, are recorded in the report of the committee, as we are persuaded it conveys a very erroneous impression of the proceedings of the committee, and the facts brought before it. The order in which the statements were made and the documents read is altogether different in the *Report* from what it was in *reality*. Why is this? The *dates* of some of the letters and documents read are given in the report; the dates of others are omitted. Why is this? A synopsis of some of the statements and documents read is given; the synopsis of other statements and documents is suppressed. Why is this? And in the synopsis of some of the principal documents, those very points are omitted which constituted the leading features of those documents, and the points of difference between the two Connexions. Why is this? How is it possible for any reader to form a correct idea of the real nature and merits of a question, when the proceedings on it are thus reported?

4. We will refer to some examples in illustration of these remarks. In the enumeration of statements made and documents read in the committee, three

sued, so that we have an opportunity of laying the whole affair before our fathers and brethren at large. Our only preference is in favour of that course which will be the least tedious, occupy the least time, and occasion the least trouble—doing what we think to be right and necessary, in a candid and amicable spirit, and leaving consequences to Him who has all power in heaven and in earth, and who is 'too wise to err, and too good to be unkind.' I have the honor to be, &c. (Signed) EGERTON RYERSON.

"The Rev. Dr. Bunting, &c. &c. &c."

The following was Dr. Bunting's answer to the foregoing note.

"Dr. Bunting has considered Mr. Ryerson's note of this morning, but is still of opinion that both our uniform usage in all such cases, and the merits of this case itself, render the course now proposed the only proper one."

letters are mentioned under the heads 9, 10, and 11; one from Dr. Alder to the President of the Canada Conference, a second from the Missionary Secretaries to Sir George Arthur, the third from the President of your conference to the Rev. E. Ryerson (dated March 23, 1839.) Now the reader would suppose, from the order and the synopsis given of these letters, that they were read to illustrate and establish the allegation, that the organ of the Canada Conference had unjustifiably interfered with secular party politics; yet the very reverse was the fact. Mr. E. Ryerson commenced his reply to Dr. Alder on Saturday evening, and resumed it on Monday afternoon. Previously to his resuming his remarks on Monday, he called for the reading of the letters referred to. Dr. Bunting and others opposed the reading of them as irrelevant; just thirty-five minutes' discussion ensued before Mr. E. Ryerson was allowed to read them. Mr. Ryerson had shown from documentary evidence, that when the union was agreed to, and from that time to 1839, the question of the Clergy Reserves was left to the uncontrolled action of the Canada Conference; that in its proceedings and views three successive Representatives of the British Conference had concurred and co-operated. He then proceeded to read the three letters in question, to prove, 1. that down to that period there was not the slightest complaint against him or the Canadian Conference on the score of interference in civil matters, as neither of those letters contained one word on the subject. 2. That each of those letters refers to *ecclesiastical* questions *only*, or the question of the Clergy Reserves, (which phrases are synonymous in Canada, as no ecclesiastical questions have ever been discussed in Upper Canada besides the Clergy Reserves;) thence stating the fact, that with the interference of the Missionary Secretaries in the question of the Clergy Reserves, contrary to the declaration of both the Representatives of the British Conference at the time the Union took place, and contrary to the administration of it during six years, commenced the misunderstandings between the English and Canada Connections. But what a totally different idea and meaning do those letters convey, from the order in which they are enumerated in the report of the committee, and the partial and unfair synopsis which is given of them.

Again, at No. 12, it is stated, "Extracts from the Minutes of the Upper Canada Conference, held at Hamilton in June 1839, containing settlements of matters in dispute up to that period, and an amicable arrangement for the future." There were two resolutions passed at the Hamilton Upper Canada Conference of June 1839; the one rescinded three out of six resolutions which had been adopted two years previous on Government grants; the other, while it deprecated interference in secular party politics, reiterated the views of the Conference on the question of the Clergy Reserves, and its determination to maintain its constitutional and just rights; a resolution to which Dr. Alder assented, though it contained sentiments wholly at variance with the views expressed in the three letters mentioned in the preceding paragraph, one of which letters had been written by Dr. Alder himself, and two of them signed by him only a few months prior to the session of that Conference!

Again. At No. 16, mention is made of a Memorial addressed by the Rev. Messrs. Stinson and Richey to the Governor-General of Canada; but the *date* and *objects* of that Memorial are not stated; both of which are of the greatest importance in judging of the merits of the case, and of the conduct of Mr. E. Ryerson. That Memorial is dated 3rd of Jan. 1840, just a *fortnight* BEFORE Mr. Ryerson's letter (dated Jan. 17, 1840.) of which you complain was addressed to the Governor-General. Mr. Ryerson's letter was unofficial—not pretended to be official, and not signed or addressed by Mr. R. in any official capacity; the Memorial was *professedly official*, signed by Mr. Stinson, as the "*President of the Conference*," and by Mr. Richey, as "*Superintendent of Toronto City*." Mr. Ryerson's letter was prepared in obedience to the request of the Governor-General; the Memorial was spontaneous as well as official. The Memorial was *aggressive* in its origin and objects; Mr. Ryerson's letter was *defensive*. The prayer of the Memorial went to deprive the

Conference of the Wesleyan Methodist Church in Canada of its just and hitherto acknowledged rights; the conclusions of the letter went to secure those rights. The Memorial was connected with a declaration to the Governor-General on the part of Messrs. Stinson and Richey, that the *Union would be dissolved*. Mr. Ryerson's letter provided against the occurrence of such an event. The communications of Messrs. Stinson and Richey and their Memorial were secret— independent of the committee of which they were members;—the Memorial was never seen by a single preacher in Canada, until its production was required at the session of the Conference in June, and contained sentiments in opposition to the recorded opinions of the Canada Conference, to which both Messrs. Stinson and Richey had previously subscribed. Mr. Ryerson's letter expressed views in accordance with the recorded views of the committee and conference of which he was a member. There were, therefore, important reasons for omitting the mention of both the date and objects of the Memorial, in the *printed* proceedings of your conference. Compare Mr. Ryerson's first letter to the Governor-General, dated Jan. 2, 1840, and the purport of the interview it mentions, with the Memorial of Messrs. Stinson and Richey, dated the day following, and the purport of the interview to which it refers, and let any man judge who acted the honourable, and who the "unauthorised and clandestine" part.

A fourth example: At No. 26, the Report of the committee states, "Correspondence of the Rev. Egerton Ryerson with the Governor-General of British North America." Now we furnished the committee, through Dr. Bunting, with copies of the whole of that correspondence. Why are the *dates* and the *titles* of the documents contained in that correspondence suppressed? That correspondence contains the completest refutation of the allegations of your committee on Canadian affairs against Mr. Ryerson that the nature of the case will afford. 1. It contained a letter from Mr. Ryerson to the Governor-General, dated Jan. 2, 1840, relative to the Government grant to your committee, a letter which refutes your allegations. 2. Two letters addressed by Mr. Ryerson to the Governor-General, dated 5th and 6th of June, 1840, enclosing a copy of the Resolutions of your committee, dated 29th April, 1840, requesting a copy of His Excellency's despatch to Lord John Russell, referred to in those resolutions, and soliciting the testimony of His Excellency on certain of the committee's allegations, respecting which His Excellency was the only human witness or authority that could be appealed to.* Mr. Ryerson had been

* The following are the letters alluded to:

Toronto, June 5, 1840.

MAY IT PLEASE YOUR EXCELLENCY,—I arrived at home last night from a long tour; and since my arrival the accompanying resolutions were enclosed to me by the Rev. Mr. Stinson, Agent of the Wesleyan Missionary Committee in London. I lose not a moment in enclosing a copy of them to your Excellency, as they refer to what has transpired between your Excellency and myself on the financial relations which exist between the Wesleyan Conference in England and the Conference of the Wesleyan Church in Canada.

The subjects of these resolutions will be fully investigated at our approaching annual Conference of Ministers, which commences its session on Wednesday next, in Belleville. As your Excellency is the only authority to which I can appeal on some of the matters referred to, I hope the urgency and peculiarity of the case will excuse, in your Excellency's mind, the liberty I take in most respectfully soliciting from your Excellency answers to the following questions.

1. Did not Mr. Stinson and Mr. Richey desire your Excellency to secure a specific portion of the proceeds of the clergy reserves to the control of the Wesleyan Conference in England; and did they not assign as one reason for that arrangement the probability of the dissolution of the union between the English and Canadian Conferences?

2. Did not your Excellency determine to write to Lord John Russell on the subject of the grant to the Wesleyan Missionary Committee in consequence of examining the documents which related to it, and the articles of union between the British and Canadian Conferences, and without any application on my part?

3. Did I not draw up the letter explaining the financial relations between the British and Canadian Conferences, in compliance with your Excellency's expressed wish?

favoured with the reading of the Governor-General's despatch. It was the only document in existence that could prove the part which had been taken in the matter. He applied for it. This was *prima facie* evidence of his consciousness of having acted honourably. But the titles and dates of these letters are suppressed in the *printed* proceedings of your committee and conference! 3. That correspondence also contained the Governor General's answer, (dated June 12, 1840) to the letters just mentioned. His Excellency conceived it to be irregular for him to furnish a copy of his despatch; but he replies explicitly to Mr. Ryerson's questions, and communicates so much of the contents of his despatch as related to the matters submitted to him. In this Reply, His Excellency states (1) That he had learned from Mr. Stinson of the probable dissolution of the Union. (2) That Mr. Ryerson had never applied to him on the subject of the Government grant to the London Wesleyan Missionary Committee. (3) That Mr. Ryerson's letter to him, dated Jan. 17, 1840, was prepared in compliance with His Excellency's request. Yet all mention of this most important document is suppressed in the *printed* Report of your conference proceedings! (4) That correspondence contained likewise a copy of the Address of the Canada Conference to the Governor-

I will feel myself greatly obliged by your Excellency's earliest reply, addressed to me at Belleville. I have the honor to be, &c. (Signed) EGBERTON RYERSON.

His Excellency the Governor General.

Toronto, June 6, 1840.

MAY IT PLEASE YOUR EXCELLENCY,—Since my letter of yesterday to your Excellency was mailed, I find that I am unable to procure from Mr. Stinson a copy of your Excellency's despatch to Lord John Russell on the subject of the Government grant to the English Wesleyan Conference, referred to in the London Committee's resolutions, which I enclosed to your Excellency, although it appears that Lord John Russell furnished Mr. Alder with a copy of that despatch, and although I have obtained copies of the other parts of the correspondence mentioned in those resolutions.

Your Excellency having kindly read that despatch to me, previously to sending it to Lord John Russell, I know it to be of the utmost importance to me in the approaching investigations.

May I therefore beg that your Excellency will have the kindness to enclose to me, by return of post, a copy of the despatch referred to, addressed to me at Belleville.

I have the honor to be, &c.

EGBERTON RYERSON.

His Excellency the Governor General.

[His Excellency's reply is as follows:]

"Government House, Montreal, June 12, 1840.

"SIR,—I am commanded by the Governor General to acknowledge the receipt of your letters of the 5th and 6th inst: the first enclosing a copy of certain resolutions adopted by the committee of the British Wesleyan Conference with reference to your conduct on the 29th April last; the second, requesting a copy of the despatch respecting the grant for the support of the Wesleyan Missions in Upper Canada, which his Excellency addressed to Lord John Russell in the month of February last. These letters having unfortunately arrived during his Excellency's temporary absence from Montreal, the answer to them has been unavoidably delayed.

"His Excellency desires me to say, that as he cannot gather from the resolutions of the British Conference that his despatch to the Secretary of State had been communicated to them, as you suppose, and as he has reason to think from other circumstances that such a proceeding would not be adopted, it would be irregular in him to furnish you with a copy of that despatch, however much he may regret his being unable to do so; because, had he been able to send it to you, it would not only have fully explained his views, and the grounds upon which he is of opinion that the grant should be distributed in a manner different from that which has of late been followed, but would have afforded the most conclusive evidence on some of the points noticed in your letter of the 5th inst. It would have shown, for instance, that his Excellency's communication with the Secretary of State originated in an examination of the whole of the circumstances of the Wesleyan body in Upper Canada, and of the documents relative to the union between the British and Canadian Conferences, which were submitted to him;—and upon this point I am directed to add, in reply to your question, that this examination did not proceed from any request of yours, and that the letter drawn up by you in explanation of the financial relations of the two bodies, was prepared at his Excellency's request. It would also further show, that it was from the Rev. Mr. Sinsou that his Excellency first heard of the probable dissolution of the two Societies.

"(Signed)

T. W. C. MURDOCH, Chief Secretary."

General, June, 1840, together with His Excellency's reply; a Reply which completely refutes Dr. Alder's insinuations against the political character of his brether in Canada, in his letter to Lord John Russell, dated 29th April, 1840. Yet no mention is made of these very important documents in the printed Report of the proceedings of your Conference!

We will pursue this kind of inquiry no further, although you have furnished us with ample materials to prosecute it at great length. With the *motives*, or *designs*, or *reasons*, of such a method of reporting the proceedings of your Conference, we have nothing to do; we judge not; we have to deal with *facts*; and, although we are but *two*, and ye are *many*, we speak with confidence. and with confidence we contemplate the issue, as our appeal is not to names or numbers, but to *documents*, the import of which cannot be varied by names, nor their evidence weakened by numbers.

5. We have now to advert to the conduct of Messrs. Stinson and Richey, extracts of whose letters were read in your committee, and respecting whom your Conference—or rather the remainder of your Conference—has, doubtless from a strong conviction of necessity, passed an approbatory resolution. Your report mentions the reading of extracts of letters written by Mr. Stinson to the Wesleyan Mission House in London, during the months of *October* and *November*, 1836,—a period when Mr. Stinson was professedly co-operating most cordially with the Canada Conference—when he professed to be on terms of friendship and *intimacy* with Mr. E. Ryerson—when he and Mr. E. Ryerson prepared and published, under peculiar circumstances, an Address to the Members of the Methodist Church in Upper Canada, containing abundant internal evidence, that Mr. Stinson cordially supported the views of the Canada Conference, on the question of an ecclesiastical establishment in that province,* though at variance with the views expressed in a Memorial which he subsequently joined with Mr. Richey in presenting to the Governor-General of Canada! An extract of another letter from Mr. Stinson, dated 20th March, 1840, was read in your Committee. In that letter Mr. S. states to the Missionary Committee, "I have lost all confidence in the men with whom I act; and if you choose to degrade yourselves any longer by a connexion with such men, I hope you will permit me to retire from the province." Such were Mr. Stinson's words, as nearly as we could take them down while Dr. Alder was reading his letter. Yet a short time after the writing of that letter for perusal and action in *England*, Mr. Stinson declared, before those "men" in Conference assembled in *Canada*, that he conceived the Canadian Preachers worthy to stand, in every respect, upon an equal footing with English Preachers; that he earnestly desired to perpetuate the connexion between the two bodies; that he would consider it wrong for the Government to pay the Committee the Grant out of the Clergy Reserve Fund, if it should, in the slightest degree, affect the claims or interests of the Connexion in Canada; that in the event of a dissolution of the Union, he should consider it wrong for the Committee in London to attempt to retain possession of those Indian Missions which had been established by the Canada Conference prior to the Union. Relying upon

* The following are passages from the Address alluded to:

"We have asked for no change in our Constitution of Government; nor in our relation to the Mother Country; we have asked for equal rights and privileges under our present form of Government; and our free Constitution secures to us the means of obtaining all our demands in a peaceful, bloodless, yet effectual way."

"Let us, then, brethren, regardless of past injuries, or present grounds of complaint, rally around the standard of our country in obedience to the authorities whom Almighty God has in His Providence placed over us; and when peace and safety in the land are again re-established, we will, one and all, renew, with redoubled ardour, our exertions to obtain those rights, and privileges, and advantages which belong to us as men, as Christians, and as Canadian British subjects.

JOSEPH STINSON, President of the Conference.
EGERTON RYERSON, Secretary of the Conference."

"City of Toronto, November 19, 1838."

such professions and declarations, the Canada Conference requests Mr. Stinson to accompany its Representatives to England "for co-operation and aid." He comes to England, and "aids" and "co-operates with" the Representatives of the Canada Conference, by extracts of such letters as we have above quoted, and by kindred verbal statements and representations; and is then thanked by your Committee and the remainder of your Conference! But resolutions of Committees or Conferences cannot alter facts, or make crooked things straight, or darkness light.

And then extracts of calumnious letters against his Canadian brethren from Mr. Richey, are read in your Committee; and Mr. Richey tells your Committee, that the "ministerial character is degraded" in Canada; that there is little "chemical affinity" in the Connexion there with British Wesleyan Methodism; and that during his four years' residence in that Province, he was treated (to use his own emphatic words) "AS A STRANGER, A FOREIGNER, AND AN ALIEN." Mr. Richey was invited to Upper Canada as principal of the Conference Academy; the Board of that Institution applied to an American College to confer upon him the honorary degree of Master of Arts, and paid his travelling expenses while visiting American Colleges, and in pursuit of a diploma; paid him for three years a salary about twice as high as that of any other Wesleyan minister in Canada; and when it was not deemed advisable to ask him to continue in that situation any longer, he was stationed in the City of Toronto, the *City Road Circuit* of the Canada Connexion. The Conference had requested him to prepare for publication a volume of sermons, and directed its Book Steward to publish them; the Editor of the *Christian Guardian*.—Mr. E. Ryerson, wrote as encomiastic a notice of those sermons, when published, as the warmest friendship could dictate; and although the Canada Conference could not approve of Mr. Richey's views and conduct in reference to the Resolutions of the London Committee, and his communications with the Governor-General, it possessed sufficient judgment and charity to discriminate between a man's views and proceedings in certain circumstances, and his general character, and therefore, on Mr. Richey's departure for England, transmitted to the British conference a flattering testimony of respect and affection in relation to him. Mr. Richey comes to the British conference, and tells you he had been treated, during four years' residence in Upper Canada, "*as a stranger, a foreigner, and an alien*;" and you express your "hearty esteem and approbation of the ability, fidelity, and diligence" with which he had "performed the duties officially confided to him!" Thanks and eulogies thus obtained are dearly purchased; and whatever influence the representations of Messrs. Stinson and Richey may have had upon your proceedings against the Canada conference, we are persuaded they will operate very differently in Canada, where the facts to which we have referred are well and generally known.

6. The decision of your committee and the remainder of your conference on the main questions now demand our notice. You say that the "matters of complaint" contained in the Resolutions of the London committee of the 29th of April are regarded as "fully proved." But look at the facts in reference to the main point, namely, Mr. E. Ryerson's conduct in relation to the Government grant. Your Resolutions charge him with "an utter want of ingenuousness and integrity in attempting to get possession, in behalf of the Canadian conference, in whole or in part, of the grant made by the Crown to the Wesleyan Missionary Society." You decide that this allegation is "fully proved." Now, upon what evidence? You do not pretend that Mr. Ryerson had communication with any other officer of the Government than the Governor General of Canada on the subject; and the Governor General tells you that Mr. Ryerson had never applied to him on the subject, and that his examination of it, and the conclusions to which he came on it, were not the result of any application from Mr. Ryerson; and yet you decide that your own allegation is "fully proved!" We know that the testimony of the Governor General was

very little regarded by your committee; that his Excellency was spoken of by Dr. Bunting and others as not to be relied upon; and that Mr. E. Ryerson was much reprobated for identifying himself and the Canada conference with the administration of such a man; and your decision confirms what was expressed by individuals on that point. But notwithstanding, there is the evidence, and here is your decision—the one antagonist to the other. However lightly your committee or conference may treat the authority or word of her Majesty's noble representative in Canada, others will properly respect it.

But your decision is at variance with itself, as well as a charge of falsehood against Lord Sydenham. In one part of your Resolutions you condemn Mr. E. Ryerson for an utter want of ingenuousness and integrity, in attempting to obtain for the Canada conference the grant which had been given to the British conference; in another part of your Resolutions, you condemn him (in respect to the same identical allegation) for “not *opposing*, but *rather* countenancing, the payment of our grant in a certain contingency, not to us, but to the Upper Canada Conference.” The one part of your own decision, therefore, contravenes and neutralizes the other, and completely refutes your own allegation.

Really, Mr. E. Ryerson's case is rather a hard, as well as an anomalous one—arraigned upon the same charge before two conferences on two sides of the Atlantic; acquitted, sustained, and honoured by the one, and then substantially acquitted, and yet at the same time fearfully condemned by the other!

7. Then, as to the charge of superseding the Rev. Joseph Stinson, as President. Now, view this in reference both to Methodist *discipline* and *usage* in Canada, and in respect to the *facts* themselves. (1.) The Articles of Union provided that the “President of the (Canadian) Conference shall exercise the same functions generally as the present General Superintendent now actually exercises.” It was shown to your committee, and denied by none, that the “General Superintendent” never had claimed or exercised the functions in Canada which you have claimed for your President there; that the Canada conference, as well as the American conferences generally, had, from the beginning, appointed a committee, or some person specially to guard its rights and communicate with the Government on its affairs; that Mr. E. Ryerson had been successively appointed to that office, and had practically exercised it with the sanction of the Canada conference during more than ten years; and that his appointment at the preceding session of the Canada conference had special reference to the very matters on which he communicated with the Governor-General. Then, where was the departure from usage, much less a violation of the Articles of Union? (2.) But, secondly, look at the facts of the case. Mr. Stinson and Mr. Richey communicated with the Governor-General *privately* and *separately*, independent of the committee of which they were members, as well as Mr. Ryerson, and on the very same day; and in the well and widely-known feelings on the part of Messrs. Stinson and Richey, which they expressed in their interview with the Governor-General, will be found abundant reason why Mr. Ryerson, as the guardian of the rights and interests of the Methodist Church in Canada, ought not to have conferred with them if he had been so disposed. But the real ground of dissatisfaction is, not that Mr. Ryerson communicated with the Governor-General, but that his communications were more successful, because more just and reasonable, than those of Messrs. Stinson and Richey. Then, again, Mr. Ryerson waited upon the Governor-General in obedience to His Excellency's commands; he prepared his letter for the Governor-General in obedience to the same commands. Ought he to have obeyed or disobeyed? Was ever such a pretension set up before on the part of any ecclesiastical body, since the days of the Inquisition, that the Governor of a country should not send for and consult whom he pleased, and that the individuals on whom he might thus call should not communicate with him in the manner that he requested, except upon pain of ecclesiastical censure! Was the Canada Conference not to open its mouth to the Government except in a manner the Missionary Secretaries in London

might prescribe? Suppose the doctrine, the new and strange doctrine, of your committee had been acted upon in Canada, and that Mr. Stinson had been regarded as the "Official Agent and Representative of the Wesleyan Body in Canada," in communicating with the government, where would have been, at this hour, the rights and interests of that Body in respect to the Clergy Reserves? Such pretensions are admirably adapted to accomplish the political and financial schemes of your Missionary Secretaries; but they would be death to the civil rights and just interests of the Wesleyan Methodist Church in Canada.

8. The last of your specific charges is, "The decidedly and prominently political character of the Christian Guardian, in violation of pledges given to us and to the Upper Canada conference, from 1833 to 1839." Here several things are to be observed. *First*, The Upper Canada conference have given you the opposite of any authority for saying that pledges given it had been violated. *Second*, The only resolution which was ever passed by the Canada conference relative to the non-interference of the Christian Guardian in political matters prior to 1839 (and which you interpret as a "pledge") was passed in 1834. Therefore, pledges could not have been given you "from 1833 to 1839." *Third*, Dr. Alder himself, your Representative accuser, said in your committee, that he never heard any complaint of the Guardian, as far as Mr. Ryerson was concerned, from 1834 to 1833. Dr. Alder stated to the conference in Canada in 1839, that, during the editorship of Mr. E. Evans (three years) he considered the Christian Guardian "a capital paper;" yet every reader of the Guardian, both in England and in Canada, knows that it was as decidedly and as actively political during that period as during any other period of its existence. But the tone of its politics then were rather more congenial with those of Dr. Alder and his colleagues, and that makes all the difference. But your censures now sweep over the entire period from 1833 to 1839, notwithstanding the facts we have referred to, your silence during six years, and the sanction and co-operation of your Representatives in Canada. Your committee was extremely averse to allowing Mr. E. Ryerson to follow Dr. Alder an inch beyond the Conference of 1839; yet your Report covers the whole period since 1833. *Fourth*, Your Report states in one place, that all matters were satisfactorily arranged down to the Canada conference of June, 1839. Then why do you resort to previous dates in search of complaints and grounds of difference? Such a course of proceeding is at variance with the usages of all judicial and deliberative bodies. *Fifth*, Dr. Alder returned from America to England in October, 1839; he read in your committee an extract of a letter from Mr. Stinson, dated Toronto, October 9, 1839, in answer to one from him (Dr. A.) dated New York, October 9, 1839, in which it was explicitly stated, that all questions of difference respecting the Christian Guardian were amicably and satisfactorily settled. Dr. Alder, in the early part of January, 1840, stated the successful and happy results of his Mission to Canada to the Missionary committee, and received a cordial vote of thanks from the committee; which was published in the Watchman newspaper. Early in November, 1839, on his return from a centenary tour of upwards of two months, Mr. E. Ryerson resumed the Editorship of the Guardian, within a fortnight after which the Governor-General assumed the government of Upper Canada. Your whole ground of opposition to Mr. E. Ryerson and the Canada conference is, therefore, by your own showing, narrowed down to the period of Lord Sydenham's administration of the Canadian Government.

At the Canadian conference in June, 1839, when Dr. Alder was present, and at your conference in Newcastle, it was maintained by us, and we believe will be disputed by none, that there are three cases, and three cases only, in which a departure from *neutrality* in civil affairs on the part of any religious community, in its official character, can be justified. 1. When the Government or civil institutions of a Country are endangered by rebellion, or conspiracy, or dangerous organization, or aggression. 2. When any great measures or questions are before the Government and legislature of a country which directly

and deeply involve the civil rights of communities and individuals, and the great interests of religion, such as Lord Sidmouth's Bill in 1811, Colonial Slavery, Government Education measure in England in 1839, and the Clergy Reserve Question in Canada. 3. When the civil institutions of a country and the system of its government are being formed and established anew. Now, take these principles in connexion with the history and circumstances of U. Canada when Lord Sydenham assumed the government of that Province. The Clergy Reserve Question was pending, and the settlement of it was proposed to be undertaken by the Government; a new constitution and system of government had been deliberately determined upon by the Imperial Authorities, and Lord Sydenham was deputed and commissioned to obtain the consent of the inhabitants of Canada to these great measures, and to carry them into effect. He found the country depressed, agitated, and divided; he commenced the herculean task of elevating, tranquillizing, and uniting it, and preparing the way for a happier state of things. After some weeks, His Excellency requested the attendance of Mr. E. Ryerson, at that time Editor of the acknowledged organ of the Wesleyan Body in Canada, and special representative of the Conference to the Government in relation to its rights and interests. His Excellency desired to hear Mr. Ryerson's opinions and wishes, and then communicated his own intentions, and desired every aid that could be given to accomplish them. Mr. R. knew that although he would not be required to sacrifice his principles, he must yield his preferences on the question of the Clergy Reserves and several other matters; but after mature deliberation, and with a consciousness of the difficulties of his situation,* he determined—not to raise a vexatious opposition to the government, which he had the fairest opportunity to do (and which Messrs. Stinson and Richey desired him to do, on the questions both of the union of the Provinces and the Clergy Reserves)—not to fan the flame of

(From the London Edition.)

* *Note by E. Ryerson.*—Lord Sydenham well knows the feelings of reluctance and apprehension under which I assumed the responsibility of giving my humble and earnest support to the measures of his government in Upper Canada. He well knows that I anticipated opposition from Dr. Alder and his friends, as well as from certain parties in Canada, and he well knows that I adopted the course I did with a deep consciousness that it would be attended with personal sacrifice, with no other expectation or wish but justice to the church to which I belonged—equal justice to other churches—and the hope of prosperity to my native country under an improved and efficient system of government. I did not, indeed, expect that hostility against me from London would be prosecuted to the extent it has been; but whatever injuries the proceedings of the London and Newcastle committees of the British Conference may inflict upon my reputation and character, I enjoy the satisfaction—the unspeakable satisfaction—of knowing that no man has ever whispered the imputation of *selfish* and *mercenary* motives against me, and that I have incurred the censures of the British Conference for supporting, and not for opposing, the Government, when it needed my support, and when it was in my power to have embarrassed it. After the objects of Lord Sydenham's government in Upper Canada had been accomplished, and after the public mind had been made thoroughly acquainted with his Lordship's views, and intentions, and wishes on the general principles of his administration, and corresponding duties of all classes of the community in relation to it, in order to advance the best interests of the country, I frankly told his Excellency that while I, in my individual capacity, should feel it a pleasurable duty to contribute any little assistance in my power to promote the great objects of his government, yet that I thought it wrong, in any ordinary circumstances, to commit the official organ of a religious community to the discussion of political questions, and that I must now withdraw the *Guardian* from all discussion of that kind. I am happy to know that his Excellency approved of my course. I do not regret the confidence I have reposed in his Excellency. That confidence, in both his uprightness and ability, has been strengthened and confirmed by all that I have witnessed or known of his plans and administration. I believe his Excellency has fairly earned the distinctions which have been conferred upon him. I am thankful that my brethren in Canada have, with great unanimity, sustained me in the humble support I have endeavoured to render to his Excellency's administration. I trust his Excellency will not be required to do an act of injustice to them for the sake of those who would have crushed, and would still crush, him and his government, had it been, or were it, in their power. As it respects myself personally, I shall not repine at being made the sacrifice, if the new system of government but succeeds, and the land of my birth and of my affections is made prosperous and happy.

party spirit, but—to aid the Representative of his Sovereign to break down the destructive party discussions and divisions, and to obliterate the miseries of the past, and to usher in an era of safety, peace, and prosperity to that Province. Lord Sydenham having accomplished the object of his mission to Upper Canada, the organ of the Wesleyan Body avowedly and practically assumed its appropriate position of neutrality and non-interference in secular affairs, and continues, as we trust it always will continue, to do so.

Now, was such a course really worthy of praise or dispraise? What article of the Union did it violate? And by how many noble examples in church history is it justified? If in February, 1839, your Missionary Secretaries could write to, and applaud Sir George Arthur as Lieutenant-Governor of Upper Canada, where was the crime in February, 1840, in Mr. E. Ryerson supporting the Governor-General of Canada, except in this, that the former was a *Tory*, and the latter a *Whig* Governor, and no favorite with the leading members of your Conference? When the “*Christian Guardian*,” in the hands of Mr. E. Evans, decidedly and warmly supported the administration of Sir Francis Head in 1836 and 1837, it was, in the judgment of Dr. Alder, “a capital paper;” the same course of proceeding on the part of Mr. E. Ryerson, in reference to a *Whig* Governor-General, under the most eventful and imperative circumstances, is, in the judgment of your committee, a serious violation of obligations and duty! Such manifest inconsistencies in your proceedings on this point are calculated to induce the conviction that there is more of political party feeling than religious conviction involved in them. At all events, we are fully convinced that there is much more political feeling in your conference than there is in the conference of the Wesleyan-Methodist Church in Canada.

9. Your reference to the Clergy Reserves is superfluous, as you know that question has recently been settled by Act of Parliament. Your reference to non-interference in secular affairs, was also equally unnecessary, as you know the *Christian Guardian* has for months, both by authority and practically, been as free from secular party discussions as your own Magazine. You are aware that we told your committee from the beginning, that you could not go further on that subject than we were prepared on behalf of the Canada conference to go with you. And we are persuaded there is less inclination on the part of Wesleyan Ministers in Canada to interfere with questions of civil polity, and less probability of their doing so, either from the pulpit or the press, than there is on the part of many leading Wesleyan Ministers in England.

10. But while you would allow no interference with secular questions, you would require the organ of the Wesleyan conference in Canada, not only to acquiesce in, but to “admit and maintain” the duty of the State to support religion—the theory of a National church establishment. Now we have shown no disposition to interfere with the National Establishment in England, (we laid before your committee ample evidence on this point); but we must object to the expediency of insisting upon this theory in respect to Upper Canada, and to the requiring of its advocacy in the abstract as a Wesleyan duty. 1. There is no idea in any quarter of Government creating new endowments for the support of religion in Upper Canada. It has had trouble enough with those already created; it has at length disposed of them; and there the matter should end. It is neither expedient nor politic to introduce a new element of discussion into the Wesleyan body in Upper Canada—not to say a fire-brand of contention. 2. But where, we would ask, is the *Wesleyanism* of requiring the advocacy of that principle in the abstract? Is there one word on the subject in Mr. Wesley’s *Four Volumes of Sermons* and *Notes on the New Testament*? Was the *Wesleyan Magazine*, during Mr. Wesley’s life, characterized by such discussions? What is Mr. Wesley’s judgment and that of his conference on the subject? It is as follows:

“*Quest.* What instance or ground is there in the New Testament for a National Church?

"*Ans.* We know of none at all; we apprehend it to be a merely political institution."

Now, is a "*political institution*" any part of *Wesleyan Methodism*?—And is its *advocacy* enjoined either in the New Testament, or by Mr. Wesley? The multiplication of terms of communion or union is as unscriptural and as un-Wesleyan as it is unwise and inexpedient; and in Canada the less said on the question of a church establishment the better, both for the Government and the country.

11. Your Committee have intimated the idea of continuing the *union*, but in connexion with a conglomeration of materials calculated to degrade the Canada Conference as much as possible, and in connexion with conditions and claims of prerogative which reduce the Wesleyan Body in Canada (more numerous and influential, by its own unassisted exertions, than the *assisted* Wesleyan Body of any other Province in British North America) to an ecclesiastical nonentity—a mere agency to accomplish your purposes—yet to support its own preachers, travelling and superannuated, and all its own institutions!—You may be assured that Englishmen, and British subjects of all classes, like to manage their own affairs in Canada as well as they do in England, and especially when it is provided by articles or rules that they shall support themselves.*

(*Note from the London Edition.*)

* In the course of the Committee and Conference proceedings at Newcastle, reference was frequently made by Dr. Alder and others to the Rev. Messrs. CASE and E. EVANS, as if they were opposed to the views of the Canada Conference. It may be remarked, that whatever diversity of opinion there may be on certain civil and ecclesiastical questions and the merits of an individual member of the Canada Conference, there is not, as far as we know, any difference of opinion amongst preachers in Canada as to the *powers* and *privileges* of that Conference under the articles of union. In 1836 a select committee of the Upper Canada House of Assembly was appointed on the subject of "Government grants made to certain religious denominations in the Province." In the course of the investigation of the subject, the select committee made inquiries into the nature of the union between the English and Canada conferences; and the Rev. Messrs. STINSON, EVANS, and CASE, were examined as witnesses. The following extracts from their printed evidence will explain their views on that subject.

From the Rev. JOSEPH STINSON'S Evidence.

"433. Will you be good enough to state to the committee how the missionaries employed by that Society (Wesleyan Missionary Society) are appointed to their work?—They are appointed by THE CANADA CONFERENCE.

"434. Are they in any manner under your superintendence, and will you be good enough to state the extent and authority of that superintendence?—I beg to refer the committee to the articles of union between the Canada and English Conference as an answer to that question.

"435. Will you be good enough to inform the committee what authority the Parent Missionary Society in England exercises over the Canada Conference Missionary Society of the Wesleyan Methodist Church?—*I know of no authority it exercises except that which is stated in the Articles of Union.*"

From the Rev. EPHRAIM EVANS' Evidence.

"73. Is the Union of the Wesleyan Methodist Church with the Wesleyan Methodist Society of Great Britain, a Union in every respect constituting them one church?—They are not one church in every respect—they are the same in the doctrines which they hold and inculcate—in the general rules of the Societies under their care—and generally in the great features of their internal economy and modes of operation; differing in the latter respects, however, according to the different circumstances of the two countries. Each, however, retains a DISTINCT and PROPER INDEPENDENCY,—neither Conference having any right to exercise disciplinary control or ecclesiastical jurisdiction over the Societies of the other, nor having any claim upon the funds or the property of the other, excepting a portion of the Missionary funds as provided for in the Articles of the Union. The Union has been effected on such principles as not to affect the identity of either Body."

From the Rev. WILLIAM CASE'S Evidence.

"250. Do the church to which you belong and the Wesleyan Methodists in England form but one Body, or are they distinct Churches?—They are distinct Bodies; the British Conference in England forms one distinct and independent Body—the Wesleyan

No other ecclesiastical body in Great Britain has claimed a control over a religious body in Canada, *without being responsible for its support*; although there are bodies in Great Britain who liberally aid their more needy brethren in Canada, without exercising any dominion over them. The "Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts," is responsible for the greater part of the salaries of the episcopal clergymen in U. Canada, and yet interferes very little with the appointments or proceedings of the clergy in that province. *The Congregational Colonial Missionary Society* does the same in respect to nearly all the Congregational ministers in Upper Canada; as does a Missionary Society of the Church of Scotland aid the ministers of that church in Canada. A few months since, the Committee of the General Assembly of the church of Scotland, generously granted £400 per annum towards supporting Professors in the new Presbyterian College, which is being established at Kingston, in Upper Canada—an institution entirely under Canadian management; nor does the General Assembly of the church of Scotland claim any portion of the Clergy Reserves from the "Presbyterian Synod of Canada;" but gives the Canadian Synod the benefit of its own influence to procure all that can be honourably obtained from provincial funds for the support of Presbyterianism and Presbyterian institutions in that country.

12. We desire now to call your attention to the act of your conference, by which you profess to dissolve the union with the Canada conference. Let it be observed, in the first place, that you have not specified or pointed out any article of union which has been violated by the Canadian conference. Your assuming new prerogatives and laying down fresh conditions, shows clearly that you are quite as much dissatisfied with the articles of the Union as you are with the Canada conference. Your act of dissolution is not based upon the violation of any one article of the Union by the Canada conference, but upon the non-compliance of the Canadian representatives with new assumptions and conditions. The question now arises, has either the British or Canadian conference power to dissolve the Union on such grounds? The Articles of Union are a contract between two parties; all contracts are *mutually* binding upon each contracting party; and can only be dissolved by *mutual* consent, or by a breach of contract by one or more of the parties concerned. You make several complaints; and so might the Canada conference complain that the understanding on the question of the Clergy Reserves had not been fulfilled on your part; that your Missionary Secretaries had exceeded their proper province in their communications to Canada on that subject; that Messrs. Stinson and Riehey had violated the "obligations arising from the Union" in their "clandestine and unauthorised" communication with the Governor-General; but all this does not amount to a breach of any article of the contract. The union has been *legally* formed and ratified; it must be *legally* dissolved, if dissolved at all. Otherwise it is no *dissolution*, but a *secession*, and involves on the part of the seceder the forfeiture of all that he may have acquired under the contract. His secession becomes a breach of the contract, and involves its consequences. And an old man or an old body may secede from a working, as well as a young one. Had you concluded unfavourably as to the working of the Union, and considered its continuance undesirable, we

Methodist Church in Canada forms another distinct and independent Body. These two distinct Bodies have formed a Union.

"251 In what respects are they the same, and how are they distinct?—They are the same in doctrine and general rules of the Society; as also in the great outlines of their economy—such as itinerancy, plans of benevolence, the support of their regular ministry by voluntary contributions, &c.; but they are *distinct in name, and independent of each other*—They manage their own internal economy in their own way, *free of the interference of each other—neither having any ecclesiastical jurisdiction or control over the members—preachers or people—of the other*: so distinct are they, that the ministers of one Conference have no right or claim to membership in the other Conference without its consent, and a regular admittance. Neither has the one Conference any control over the funds of the other."

may presume to submit, that the Methodistic, the dignified and legal mode of proceeding would have been for you to have proposed to the Canada Conference a mutual and friendly dissolution of it. But you seem to have forgotten that the Canada Conference was a body known in law as well as the British Conference; and it will be for the courts of law in Upper Canada to decide whether you have any chapel or mission property in that province, except what may have been secured to the British Conference before the union took place. The act of your Conference is nugatory as far as the abrogation of the articles of Union is concerned; but it is not nugatory as it relates to your standing and your rights in Upper Canada. Those articles are still good to the Canada Conference, until it agrees to the abrogation of them. The stationing of the missionaries is still in its own hands; and now the election of President; and an invasion of its rights, or a trespass upon its property, will not be suffered with impunity.

13. The considerations involved in these remarks may serve to impress, as well as to introduce the observations with which we will conclude this communication. We now submit to your committee the inexpediency, the impropriety, the unjustifiableness, of your attempting to prosecute divisive operations in Upper Canada; for *divisive* they must be if they are prosecuted independently of the Wesleyan Church in that province. You may say and may think otherwise; you may imagine a friendly and fraternal relation between yourselves and the Canada connexion. But could you imagine such to be the case on the part of the Canada, or American conference, should they come to *England*, and attempt to raise up distinct societies? We might make a stronger appeal on the score of *religious and moral destitution*, even in respect to *London itself*, than can with truth be made in respect to Upper Canada. But would you not say, that such an enterprise was a violation of the great principle of *Methodistic unity*? And let it not be forgotten, that whatever may be your seniority in this country to the Wesleyan body in Upper Canada, that body in that country is more than a *quarter of a century* senior to you. It has acquired an ecclesiastical and moral right of soil there, not only by discovery, but by long possession and successful and extensive cultivation; cultivation far more successful and extensive than you have effected in any other British North American province. We desire not, however, to extend our operations to Lower Canada, Nova Scotia, and New Brunswick, if we are permitted to concentrate our energies undisturbed in Upper Canada. We beg to direct the attention of your committee to the correspondence of the Canada Missionary Board with your committee in 1831 and 1832 on this very subject. The considerations then urged against your committee's establishing separate societies in that province are of greater force now than in 1832. We know you may find individual advocates and supporters in that country; and so might the Canada conference have individual supporters and advocates in this country. We dwell not upon the appearance, upon the honour of disgrace, upon the good or evil of schisms amongst either the White Societies or the Indian Tribes; but we put it to your committee, seriously and in the sight of Almighty God, whether upon the great Wesleyan and Scriptural principle, that we should not only go to those who want us, but to those who *want us most*, you are Divinely called to go into Upper Canada, and commence there the work of Missionary *division*, instead of prosecuting in other provinces, and in other parts of the world, the sublimer work of Missionary *conversion*?

We fervently desire that the Canada conference may be enabled to sustain towards your conference the most friendly relations, and cherish the same feelings, and hold the same language, which have characterised its communications in past years. We deeply deplore the course which your committee and a part of your conference have pursued. We have felt that its reported, and now printed proceedings, were calculated to inflict upon us individually—especially upon one of us—and upon our conference and church, an uncalled-for and unmerited injury, and that it was our indispensable duty to meet those charges, and imputations, and censures, with a prompt and explicit reply.

We would here banish from our bosoms any,—the least,—unkind feelings on account of injuries received; we would humbly pray for your increased purity, peace, and prosperity. We would earnestly implore the Ruler of all hearts, that your committee may be brought to pause and change their purposes before they

proceed (not upon any vital doctrine of Methodism, not upon any cardinal principle of Methodist discipline, not upon any rule of Christian practice, but upon a mere combination of varied and conflicting feelings, upon assumptions of novel and unreasonable prerogative, upon "questions which tend to strife rather than to godly edifying")—to rend the yet seamless garment of Methodism in the prosecution of an enterprise which cannot elevate the dignity of the English connexion; which cannot be contemplated with pleasure and admiration by any christian and intelligent observer; which must be viewed with feelings of mortification and regret when the ephemeral passions of the moment shall have subsided; which must form a dark page in the volume of Methodist history, and may envelope in eternal night the destinies of hundreds and thousands of converted and unconverted Aborigines of North America.

We are, Reverend and dear Sir, in behalf of the Conference of the Wesleyan Methodist Church in Canada, yours affectionately, in the Gospel of Christ,

WILLIAM RYERSON,
EGERTON RYERSON.

To the Rev. Dr. HANNAH,
Secretary to the Wesleyan Conference.

No. 13.

Letter from the Rev. R. Alder to Lord John Russell on the subject of the Government Grant to the Wesleyan Committee in London, and the financial Relations of the Wesleyan Conferences in England and in Upper Canada.

*Wesleyan Mission House, 77, Hatton Garden,
London, 29th April, 1840.*

MY LORD,—I have the honour to acknowledge, on behalf of the Committee of the Wesleyan Missionary Society, the receipt of a communication from Mr. Under Secretary Smith, in reply to a communication addressed to your Lordship by me on the 8th instant, on matters affecting the interests of the Society in Upper Canada. It is stated by Mr. Smith, that your Lordship will be ready to consider any objections which the Wesleyan Missionary Society may have to urge, to a compliance with certain proposals contained in a communication addressed by the Rev. E. Ryerson to His Excellency the Governor-in-Chief, respecting the appropriation of the annual grant of seven hundred pounds, now paid to the Wesleyan Missionary Society from the casual and territorial revenue of Canada.

Before I proceed to examine Mr. Ryerson's proposal, I beg permission to convey to your Lordship the cordial thanks of the Committee of the Wesleyan Missionary Society, for the prompt and courteous manner in which you have caused to be communicated to them a copy of Mr. Ryerson's letter, and for the opportunity which your Lordship has thus afforded them for discussing the subject to which that letter relates. While they regret that any occasion should have arisen for such a discussion, they are of opinion with your Lordship, that the course pointed out in Mr. Smith's communication is, under all circumstances, the most convenient. At all events, it cannot fail to bring out the important facts connected with the annual grant made to the Society; and, in the judgment of the Committee, nothing more will be necessary to show your Lordship that the arrangement in question is one with which Mr. Ryerson should not have interfered, and that the interference of that individual should not induce your Lordship to permit it to be disturbed.

As I am well aware of the value of your Lordship's time, occupied as it is with the cares and duties connected with the important department of Her Majesty's Government over which your Lordship presides, I am anxious to compress my statements as much as is consistent with what is due to your Lordship, and to the Society which, on this occasion, I have the honour to represent. I must, however, crave permission to advert to some of the general statements contained in Mr. Ryerson's letter, lest they should make an erroneous impression on your Lordship's mind, and thereby operate to our disadvantage.

It is *not correct*, as stated by Mr. Ryerson, that the late Rev. John Wesley recommended the formation of the Methodist Societies in America into a distinct and independent body, with the attributes and style of a Church. It is true, indeed, that at the close of the American revolutionary war, Mr. Wesley formed the Methodist Societies in the *United States* into a distinct religious community, and placed them under an episcopal form of government, and his reason for doing so was, that the thirteen colonies having become free and independent states, they were thereby politically and ecclesiastically separated from the mother country, and had renounced their allegiance to the British crown. But Mr. Wesley never intended that his arrangement in reference to the methodist societies in *that republic* should affect, in any degree, the relative position of his societies in the *British* provinces of North America, either to himself or to the British Conference, to which he bequeathed his supreme pastoral authority over all the Methodist Societies in the United Kingdom, and throughout the colonial possessions of the empire. Hence, at the present time, all the Wesleyan Ministers and members of the Society in Lower Canada, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island, and Newfoundland, as well as in all Her Majesty's colonial possessions, with one exception, are integral parts of the great religious community under the care of the British Conference, and are subject to the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of that body; an arrangement which, I may be permitted to observe, is calculated to promote the perpetuity of our united empire, inasmuch as submission to ecclesiastical authority resident in the parent state, in matters pertaining to religion, cannot fail to strengthen the political and civil ties by which the colonies are united to the mother country, and to secure loyal and constitutional obedience to the imperial government in all the colonial dependencies of the Crown.

The one exception to which I have referred is that of Upper Canada, which province, in consequence of its contiguity to the United States, was first supplied with Methodist Ministers from thence, and the societies organized in the Colony were regarded as forming a part of the Methodist Church in the neighbouring Republic, and as such were placed under foreign ecclesiastical jurisdiction. This was felt to be a very undesirable state of things. The General Conference of the United States endeavoured, with great tenacity, to retain their hold of the Methodist Society in Upper Canada. Various representations were made to the home government on this subject, and at length, in 1814, the British Conference determined to send missionaries into that province from home, who should act under their own direction.

From that period down to the year 1832, the Wesleyan Missionary Committee maintained a distinct position in Upper Canada, and I believe that the British Wesleyan Missionaries are recognised in the Provincial Marriage Act. In consequence of proposals which were made in the year 1832, by the Earl of Ripon, then Principal Secretary of State for the Colonies, to the Wesleyan Missionary Committee, to induce them to extend their missionary operations in Upper Canada, they resolved to do so, and arrangements were immediately made for carrying that resolution into effect. My Lord, the Government of Earl Grey was moved to make this offer to the Wesleyan Missionary Committee by patriotic as well as by religious considerations; and if the testimony of Lord Seaton, and other distinguished individuals, may be depended upon, a wiser arrangement could not have been proposed. On the ground of this

arrangement an annual grant is secured, on the faith of the Royal word, to the Wesleyan Missionary Committee, to assist them in meeting the expense which it necessarily involves.

The union which now exists between the British Conference and the Conference in Upper Canada, took place about a year after I had, as the representative of the Wesleyan Missionary Committee, completed at Toronto, with Lord Seaton, all the arrangements connected with the offer made by Lord Goderich to the Committee, having proceeded from England to Canada for that purpose.

It is more than doubtful, my lord, whether that union can be maintained much longer by us; but it is not doubtful whether we shall or shall not prosecute our missionary operations in Upper Canada, for the benefit of the Aborigines as well as of the Colonists. My Lord, the Wesleyan Missionary Committee will not abandon missions which they were instrumental in saving from ruin; but, relying upon the royal promise and the benevolence of the Christian public of this country, they will do their part to teach the objects of their charge in Upper Canada to "fear God and honour the Queen."

It is to me most unaccountable, that Mr. E. Ryerson should have submitted such a proposal as he appears to have done; and I cannot but express deep regret, that His Excellency the Governor-General should have forwarded to your Lordship a despatch which must, to a great extent, be founded on the *ex parte* statements contained in Mr. R.'s letter to his Excellency, inasmuch as we have reason to believe that no communications on the subject of that letter were held with our duly accredited representatives in Upper Canada, or even with the President of the Upper Canada Conference. Your Lordship's sense of justice has, however, afforded us an opportunity for laying before you the objections felt by the Wesleyan Missionary Committee to the proposal now made for alienating, in whole or in part, from them, the annual grant, and transferring it to the Upper Canadian Wesleyan Methodist Conference.

In the first place, my Lord, Mr. E. Ryerson has acted without due *authority*, in making such a proposal. He is not officially empowered to do so. Such a proposal, if made at all, should be made either by the Conference itself, or by the President of that body, who is the only functionary authorized to act in such a case during the interim of its sittings. Mr. Ryerson is merely the secretary of the Conference, and, as such, he has no more authority for acting as he appears to have done, than the Provincial Secretary of Upper Canada has, as such, to assume and exercise the functions of the Lieutenant Governor of the Province.

Secondly,—The grant was offered to the Wesleyan Missionary Committee and accepted *before the union between the British Conference and the Upper Canadian Conference was contemplated*; and all the arrangements connected with it were made before that event took place. Mr. Ryerson is pleased to state that he apprehends that there will be "no disposition on the part of the British Conference to dissolve the union, unless they can get government aid, independent of the Canadian Conference." Now the fact is, we have, from the beginning, *obtained the aid of Government, independent of the Canadian Conference*, and the difficulty that has sometimes been experienced in obtaining payment of the grant, has been owing, in a great measure, to our union with that body—a body which has always protested against receiving government aid for religious purposes.

Thirdly,—At the time that the union took place, it was stated most distinctly to Mr. E. Ryerson himself, who came to England in 1833, as the representative of the Upper Canadian Conference, to negotiate the union, that it must be clearly understood that *the union could not be permitted by us to interfere in any way with the arrangements that then existed between his late Majesty's government and the Committee, especially with the receipt and appropriation of the grant*, which fact must be in the recollection of Mr. Ryerson.

Fourthly,—This view of the case has always been taken and acted upon by the Conference of Upper Canada, which body adopted a series of resolutions on the subject of religious grants, in the year 1837, in the second and fifth of which it is distinctly stated that the annual grant was made to the Wesleyan Missionary Committee in London; and in the sixth of the said resolutions it is affirmed, "that the annual grant was made to the Wesleyan Missionary Committee in aid of the religious instruction and improvement of the Indian tribes, and is one of the conditions" upon which his Majesty's Government has consented to cede the control of the said revenue to the provincial legislature."

As the resolutions in question are founded on what is called the voluntary principle, the Missionary Committee, fearing that some parts of them might be so understood and explained as to interfere with their claim to the grant, I brought the matter before the last Conference in Upper Canada, and required that they should be rescinded, upon which occasion the following resolution was adopted:—

Resolved.—That the Rev. Mr. Alder having represented that the second, fifth, and sixth resolutions passed by this conference in June, 1837, on the subject of certain grants made by His late Majesty to the Wesleyan Missionary Committee, out of the casual and territorial revenue, interferes with the usages of our British brethren, and materially retards their interests, this conference rescind the same."†

Here, my Lord, I am under the necessity of pointing out the marked inconsistency which exists between the conduct of Mr. Ryerson and the proceedings of the last Upper Canadian Conference. In the middle of the month of June last, the above minute was adopted, for the purpose of removing, as far as the Upper Canadian Conference was concerned, all doubt as to the just claim of the Wesleyan Missionary Society to the annual grant, and yet within a few brief months, Mr. Ryerson takes upon himself to contravene the decision of the Ecclesiastical Body of which he is a member, and by so doing to contradict his own repeated and recorded opinions, that it is wrong for churches to receive aid for religious purposes from the state. Nay, my Lord, so far did he and the Upper Canadian Conference carry out the voluntary principle, that the very fact of the British Conference having sanctioned the arrangements entered into between his late Majesty's Government and the Wesleyan Missionary Committee, by virtue of which the annual grant was made to the latter, occasioned no little difficulty when the union between the British and Canadian Conferences was first proposed, from the objections officially expressed by the Upper Canadian Conference to the acceptance of such grants for such purposes; objections which were only removed by causing it to be clearly understood that the latter were in no sense parties to that arrangement, and that they were to have no connexion with, or control over the appropriation of the government grant.

The union was first sought by Mr. Ryerson and his friends, and so far from that arrangement having been sought by us for the purpose of enabling the Wesleyan Missionary Committee to receive the government grant, your Lordship will perceive that the Union between the two Conferences took place after the Wesleyan Missionary Committee had accepted the aid offered by govern-

* *Note by E. Ryerson*—This is a misquotation. The Canada Conference did not "affirm" that it "is one of the conditions," &c. The Canada Conference stated that it had been represented (by Sir F. Head) as "one of the conditions," &c.

† *Note by E. Ryerson*.—There were adopted at the same time three other resolutions on the subject of the grant, as also several resolutions on the question of the Clergy Reserves, which were not rescinded. The resolutions respecting the grant were adopted to remove erroneous impressions and even prejudices, which had been created by a message of Sir F. Head to the House of Assembly on the subject. That object having been accomplished, and it having been ascertained that the Wesleyan Committee in London took exception to three of those resolutions, the Canada Conference readily rescinded them; but it did not rescind any resolutions which related to its own claims and interests and general views.

ment, and had pledged itself to extend its missionary operations in Upper Canada, and the fact is, that one argument employed by Mr. Ryerson and others to persuade his brethren the members of the Upper Canadian Conference to agree to a union was, that that Conference did not possess the means to support the Indian missions, and that unless the Wesleyan Missionary Committee took the charge of them, they would be *utterly ruined*. Monies had been collected in the United States for them, and in this way her Majesty's Indian subjects were led to look for support to a foreign power, instead of looking for it from the mother country. But even this plan was found to be ineffectual. There were not found so many *religious* as there are *political* sympathizers in the union; and in consequence of the small amount of the aid thus obtained, and other causes, when the Wesleyan Missionary Committee took upon itself the responsibility of supporting those missions, the buildings were found to be to a great extent in a dilapidated state,—debts were due upon them, the agency was too limited; and very large sums were of necessity expended in placing them in any thing like a state of efficiency.

The financial view of the case furnished by Mr. Ryerson is equally partial and erroneous with other of his statements to the Governor-in-Chief. But without entering into particulars, as I am anxious to save your lordship's time, I shall simply submit the following facts, which I am prepared to prove, for your lordship's consideration.

1. That when the Wesleyan Missionary Committee took upon itself to support the Indian Missions, the monies raised by the Upper Canada Conference amounted to the small sum of £177 18s. 1d. sterling, since which time they have gradually increased to £1304 14s. 11d.; the largest sum ever raised during one year, an advance which is chiefly to be ascribed to two causes. First, the zeal and activity of the General Superintendent of Missions sent to Upper Canada by the Wesleyan Missionary Committee; and, secondly, to the fact that many individuals have since the Union contributed towards the support of the Missions, because they are now the Missions of the Wesleyan Missionary Society in England, and as such under the care of the British Conference, who would not have contributed towards their support if they had not been placed under the direction and control of British Methodism, and who continue to support them only for that reason.

2. The suspension of the Government Grant for two or three years *did* affect our Canadian Missions, as we were thereby prevented from increasing the number of our agents amongst the Indians and destitute settlers. Mr. Ryerson, indeed, who could know but little of the intentions of the Wesleyan Missionary Committee, states "that it did not," and insinuates in his letter to the Governor-General, that if the Committee had received the sums which were withheld from them, that they would have expended such monies granted for the Upper Canadian Missions, in extending their missionary operations elsewhere. My Lord, I have only to state in reply to such an insinuation, that whoever else may be capable of receiving money for one purpose, and appropriating it to other uses and purposes, such is not the practice of the Wesleyan Missionary Committee. They engaged not only to expend all the monies that they might receive from the Government for missionary purposes connected with Upper Canada, but also a portion of their own funds, and I cannot better show your Lordship with what fidelity they have adhered to their engagements than by laying before you the following statement:—

Total amount of Government grants received from the year 1832 to the 31st December, 1839,.....	£3,670 0 0
Total amount of missionary money raised in Upper Canada for missionary purposes,.....	4,989 16 5
	8,659 16 5

Monies expended by the Wesleyan Missionary Society in connexion with the missions in Upper (exclusive of Lower) Canada, from August 1833, to December 31st, 1839.	17,806	18	11
	8,659	16	5
	<hr/>		
	9,147	2	6

Showing, as your Lordship will perceive, that the Wesleyan Missionary Committee have actually expended on the Upper Canadian Missions during six years, no less than *nine thousand one hundred and forty-seven pounds two shillings and sixpence of its own funds*; and yet it is proposed to alienate from them the annual grant, and to throw the entire responsibility of supporting these missions upon the Society; and, indeed, to violate a Royal pledge for the purpose of inflicting a wrong upon a Society which has so faithfully fulfilled its engagements. Under such circumstances I feel that the rights of the Society are safe in the hands of your lordship. I forbear, therefore, urging on your lordship's attention the consideration that the objections which I have stated are greatly strengthened by the fact that although ere long Upper and Lower Canada will, it is expected, constitute one province, after the union of the provinces the ministers and congregations of Wesleyan Methodists in Lower Canada will remain, as they ever have done, distinct from and independent of the Upper Canada Conference, and under the direction of the Wesleyan Missionary Committee. The plan recommended by Mr. Ryerson, or in fact any alteration in the present arrangements respecting the grant, would therefore occasion great dissatisfaction amongst our Societies in the lower province. Nor is this all, my lord, the entire Methodist Connexion in the United Kingdom has its attention directed to this matter; and, feeling as they certainly would, that any such alteration would be a reflection upon their character, as if they were unworthy of the continued payment of a grant so solemnly pledged to them; they would feel it to be their duty publicly and formally to object to it, and the more so because of circumstances in Canada connected with the proposition of which the Wesleyan Missionary Society are not ignorant.

I beg leave to conclude by again appealing to your lordship with confidence, that I have shown cause why Mr. Ryerson's proposal should be rejected; and under such circumstances I am sure that you will not adopt a course which, however it might gratify Mr. Ryerson and his friends in Upper Canada, would grieve and offend the Wesleyan community in every other part of her Majesty's dominions, not so much from pecuniary considerations as for the reason I have stated above.

I have the honour to be, &c.

(Signed)

R. ALDER,
Sec. Wes. Miss. Soc.

Lord John Russell.

No. 14.

Letter from the Rev. W. and E. Ryerson to Lord John Russell, in reply to Mr. Alder.

22, Cecil Street, Strand, August 20th, 1840.

MY LORD,—We have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of Mr. Under Secretary Vernon Smith's letter of the 29th ult. enclosing a copy of the Rev. Robert Alder's letter to your lordship, dated 29th April last, purporting to be a reply to a letter from the Rev. Egerton Ryerson to His Excellency the Governor General of Canada, dated January 17th, 1840, respecting the financial relations of the Wesleyan Conferences in England and in Canada.

We beg, on behalf of the Conference of the Wesleyan Methodist Church in Canada, to express to your Lordship our sincere thanks for the opportunity which your Lordship has thus afforded us of discussing the several subjects of Mr. Alder's letter, and of vindicating the character and interests of the Wesleyan Methodist Church in Upper Canada from the erroneous statements and imputations contained in that letter.

As the circumstances under which Mr. Ryerson wrote to His Excellency

the Governor-General of Canada the letter referred to have been misunderstood, it may be worth while to state them. His Excellency, having determined to undertake the settlement of the long agitated question of the Clergy Reserves in Upper Canada, sent, during the last week in December and the first week in January last, for ministers and influential members of various religious denominations, in order to ascertain their opinions and wishes on that subject. Amongst others he sent for Mr. Ryerson, and also for the Rev. Messrs. Stinson and Richey, the former President of the Upper Canada Conference and Representative of the London Wesleyan Missionary Committee, the latter a member of the Wesleyan Conference in England, but temporarily connected with the Wesleyan Methodist Church in Upper Canada by a special vote of the Canadian Conference. As the Governor-General proposed to transfer all the religious grants which had been paid out of the casual and territorial revenues, as first charges upon the Clergy Reserve fund; and as those charges would for some years absorb the entire fund, Mr. Ryerson submitted to His Excellency the justice and reasonableness of making a grant to the Conference of the Wesleyan Methodist Church in Canada, in aid of the Upper Canada Academy, and of transferring that with the other religious grants to the Clergy Reserve fund. His Excellency objected upon the ground that several hundred pounds per annum had already been granted in aid of the Wesleyan Body in Upper Canada. Mr. Ryerson assured His Excellency that he was mistaken, and laid before His Excellency several documents to satisfy him that the grant referred to had not been made to the Wesleyan Body in Canada, nor in aid of its funds. His Excellency considered the matter of sufficient importance to require a thorough investigation, and requested Mr. Ryerson to recapitulate in writing the substance of what he had stated verbally. Mr. Ryerson did so in a letter dated January 2nd, 1840, a copy of which is herewith transmitted, marked A. On the same day (January 2, 1840), Messrs. Stinson and Richey had an interview with His Excellency, during which they informed His Excellency that the union between the English and Canadian Conferences was expected to be dissolved (a measure the most remote from the thoughts of the members of the Canadian Conference), and desired His Excellency so to frame his Bill as to secure that portion of the proceeds of the Reserves, to the control of which the Conference of the Wesleyan Methodist Church in Canada would be entitled, to the control of the Wesleyan Conference in England, for the benefit of those who should adhere to it on the dissolution of the union with the Canadian Conference. On the day following, Messrs. Stinson and Richey embodied their views in a memorial to His Excellency, a copy of which is herewith enclosed, marked B. In that memorial it will be seen, that the Wesleyan Conference in Canada is superseded by the Wesleyan Conference in England, and that when one of the articles of union between the two bodies provided that the former should have no claim upon the funds of the latter.

There is reason to believe that in the interview above alluded to, His Excellency gave Messrs. Stinson and Richey no reason to expect countenance from him to a proposition so obviously unjust and impolitic. Their views and statements furnished His Excellency with additional reasons for examining into all the existing relations and interests of the Wesleyan bodies in Canada and in England. His Excellency examined all the despatches and other documents which related to the subject, and sought for information from official persons, and from other quarters. The result of the investigation was, a strong conviction in the mind of His Excellency that the Canada Conference should alone be regarded as the head and representative of the Wesleyan Methodist Church in Canada; that the grant which had been made to the London Wesleyan Missionary Committee out of the Canadian casual and territorial revenue, operated injuriously rather than beneficially to the interests of the Conference of the Wesleyan Methodist Church in Canada, and was not distributed in a manner, and did not accomplish the objects contemplated by the Imperial

Government when that grant was made, and ought to be distributed in a different manner hereafter. His Excellency, therefore, determined to write to your Lordship on the subject. His Excellency informed Mr. Ryerson of the result of his investigations and inquiries, and requested Mr. Ryerson to prepare a statement in writing of the financial relations between the Wesleyan Conference in England and the Conference of the Wesleyan Methodist Church in Canada.

In proof of the correctness of this statement we refer your Lordship to the accompanying memorial of Messrs. Stinson and Richey to His Excellency the Governor-General; to His Excellency's despatch on the subject, addressed to your Lordship in February last; and to the following extract of a letter from Mr. Chief Secretary Murdoch, addressed to Mr. Ryerson in reply to applications which Mr. R. had made to His Excellency the Governor-General on the subject.

“Government House, Montreal, June 12, 1840.

“**SIR,**—I am commanded by the Governor-General to acknowledge the receipt of your letters of the 5th and 6th inst. : the first enclosing a copy of certain Resolutions adopted by the Committee of the British Wesleyan Conference with reference to your conduct on the 29th April last; the second, requesting a copy of the despatch respecting the grant for the support of the Wesleyan Missions in Upper Canada, which His Excellency addressed to Lord John Russell, in the month of February last. These letters having unfortunately arrived during His Excellency's temporary absence from Montreal, the answer to them has been unavoidably delayed.

“His Excellency desires me to say, that as he cannot gather from the Resolutions of the British Conference, that his despatch to the Secretary of State had been communicated to them, as you suppose, and as he has reason to think from other circumstances that such a proceeding would not be adopted, it would be irregular in him to furnish you with a copy of that despatch, however much he may regret his being unable to do so; because, had he been able to send it to you, it would not only have fully explained his views, and the grounds upon which he is of opinion that the grant should be distributed in a manner different from that which has of late been followed, but would have afforded the most conclusive evidence on some of the points noticed in your letter of the 5th inst. It would have shown, for instance, that His Excellency's communication with the Secretary of State originated in an examination of the whole of the circumstances of the Wesleyan Body in Upper Canada, and of the documents relative to the union between the British and Canadian Conferences, which were submitted to him—and upon this point I am directed to add, in reply to your question, that this examination did not proceed from any request of yours, and that the letter drawn up by you in explanation of the financial relations of the two Bodies, was prepared at His Excellency's request. It would also further show, that it was from the Rev. Mr. Stinson that His Excellency first heard of the probable dissolution of the two Societies.”

“**(Signed)** T. W. C. MURDOCH,
Chief Secretary.”

Having stated the circumstances and objects of Mr. Ryerson's letter to the Governor-General, we will now address ourselves with all possible brevity to the leading objections which Mr. Alder has brought against that letter.

Mr. Alder has not attempted to refute, nor even ventured to deny, the correctness of Mr. Ryerson's general statement respecting the financial relations between the Wesleyan Conference in England and in Canada. A Committee of the English Conference has adopted the leading views of Mr. Alder's letter, in a series of resolutions, a copy of which is herewith annexed, marked C. In reply to these resolutions, and to Mr. Alder's statements that Mr. Ryerson's letter was written without authority, and contains partial and erroneous representations, we beg to refer your Lordship to the accompanying resolutions of

the Wesleyan Conference in Canada, marked E, adopted in June last, with a unanimity almost unparalleled.

As to whether or not the late Rev. John Wesley intended the regulations which he adopted in 1784, in reference to the Methodist Societies in the United States, to extend to the British North American provinces, it is not material to the objects of the present letter to decide. Respecting Mr. Alder's denial of the correctness of Mr. Ryerson's statement on that subject, three remarks may be made:—1. Mr. Wesley's address on that occasion was directed not to the Methodist Societies in the *United States* of America, but to the Methodist Societies in *North America*. 2. In 1787, Mr. Wesley, as well as Dr. Coke, recommended the setting apart by ordination of the Rev. F. Garretson, as superintendent, or bishop, over the societies in New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, and the West Indies, the same as he himself had, in 1784, set apart by ordination the Rev. Dr. Coke, as superintendent or bishop, over the societies in North America. And at that period, during the life of M. Wesley, preachers in the provinces of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia were stationed at the Methodist Conferences in the United States. The early official printed minutes of the Conferences of the Methodist Church in the United States, and the 1st volume of the history of that church, by the Rev. Dr. Bangs, of New York, furnish ample evidence on this point. 3. In 1820, the English Conference agreed with the American Methodist Conference, to leave Upper Canada to be wholly supplied by ministers employed under the direction of the latter; which would not have been done, had it not been perfectly well known that such an arrangement was in accordance with the views and principles upon which Mr. Wesley acted.

Mr. Alder's statement, that "the General Conference of the United States endeavoured, with great tenacity, to retain their hold of the Methodist Society in Upper Canada," is equally incorrect with the one just noticed. The ecclesiastical connexion which formerly existed between the Methodist Church in the United States and in Upper Canada, down to 1828, never did exert any influence over the ministers or members of the latter, in relation to civil affairs, as is apparent from the fact, that, during the war with the United States, and on all occasions which put their principles to the test, the Methodist Church in Upper Canada has always given the strongest proofs of its loyalty. The history of Upper Canada does not furnish an instance of a member of the Methodist Church being implicated in rebellion or conspiracy against his Sovereign. But the great majority of the ministers as well as members of the Methodist Church in that Province, being British born subjects, desired, from personal feeling, as well as from deference to the understood wishes of the government, to dissolve all ecclesiastical connexion with the Methodist Church in the United States, and therefore applied to the General Conference of that Church in 1824, for a friendly *separation*; but the *representative of the British Wesleyan Conference*, the Rev. Richard Reece, opposed the application, upon the ground that the Wesleyan body in Canada was too feeble and inexperienced to manage its own affairs, and stated to the American Conference, that if they complied with the application from Canada, he should feel it his duty, on his return to England, to recommend the British Conference to send a sufficient number of missionaries from England into Upper Canada to supply the whole work. At the next quadrennial General Conference of the Methodist Church in the United States, in 1828, the application for a separation, on the part of the Methodist Conference in Canada, was renewed, and readily granted; after which time, down to 1833, when certain articles of union with the Wesleyan Conference in England were agreed to, the Methodist Church in Canada existed as an independent body, established several missions amongst the Aboriginal Indian tribes, and had an accession of more than 6,000 communicants, and procured subscriptions to the amount of nearly £6,000, towards the erection of the buildings for the Upper Canada Academy.

Mr. Alder also states, that the Wesleyan Missionary Committee have main-

tained a distinct position in Upper Canada ever since 1814. This statement is likewise calculated to mislead your Lordship. Between the years 1814 and 1820, the Wesleyan Missionary Committee sent missionaries into Upper Canada, between whom and the ministers of the Methodist Church already established in that Province, collisions ensued; in consequence of which, the British Conference agreed to withdraw all its missionaries from Upper Canada, provided the American Conference would withdraw its missionaries from Lower Canada. But the town of Kingston, in Upper Canada, being a *military* station, and a number of the military being connected with the Wesleyan Society, the Missionary Committee urged it as an *exception* to the general arrangement with the American Conference. The existence of this arrangement is referred to and admitted by the Wesleyan Missionary Committee, in its correspondence with the Wesleyan Board of Missions in Upper Canada, in 1832, as may be seen in the appendix to the accompanying printed Report of a Committee of the House of Assembly of Upper Canada on Religious Grants, adopted April, 1836, p. 31. 1st col. 4th paragraph.

Mr. Alder states again, that the "union was first sought by Mr. Ryerson and his friends," and that "one argument employed by Mr. Ryerson and others, to persuade his brethren, the members of the Upper Canada Conference, to agree to a union was, that that Conference did not possess the means to support the Indian Missions, and that unless the Wesleyan Missionary Committee took the charge of them, they would be utterly ruined."

Now, in reply to this, and kindred *ex parte* and unsupported assertions, we beg to refer your Lordship to the official correspondence which took place between the Wesleyan Missionary Committee in London, and the Wesleyan Missionary Board in Upper Canada, in the years 1831 and 1832, and which resulted in proposals of union between the two bodies. This correspondence will be found in the appendix to the accompanying printed Report of a Select Committee of the Upper Canadian House of Assembly, in 1836, on Religious Grants, pp. 28—32. We solicit your Lordship's particular attention to this correspondence, as proving, beyond the possibility of successful contradiction, 1. That the Society in Upper Canada declined transferring the Indian missions to the London Missionary Committee, when the latter proposed it. 2. That the former employed every possible argument to dissuade the latter from extending its operations into Upper Canada at all, as likely to be productive of disastrous consequences, but, at the same time, offered assistance to the London Society in the establishment of missions amongst the Aboriginal Indian tribes, west and north of Lake Huron, and in the Hudson's Bay territory. 3. That the Canada Society maintained its ability, not merely to support the missions then established, but to supply the religious wants of the Indian tribes in Upper Canada, stating, that "there is little doubt but the funds of our own society can be increased to a sufficient sum to meet the wants of the Indian tribes within the present boundaries of our Conference," and expostulating with the London Committee as follows:—"Upon the whole, it may be submitted to your Committee, whether, under existing circumstances, your mission funds could not be more advantageously applied to the furtherance of the work of human salvation, than in the establishment of a mission in this Province—other circumstances aside—at an expense far greater than would be necessary for the Methodist Missionary Society here, to impart the same doctrines, the same feelings, the same blessings, and effect the same improvements." 4. That it was not until after the Canada Missionary Board had fruitlessly employed every possible argument to induce the London Missionary Committee not to interfere with Upper Canada, that it invited Mr. Alder to consult on the propriety of a coalition between the Wesleyan Conference in England and in Upper Canada, and that that measure was proposed, not from the pressure of necessity, in order to save the "Indian missions from utter ruin," but primarily to "prevent misunderstandings," and "to preserve peace and harmony in the society."

We invite your Lordship's attention, also, to the candid, and honorable, and Christian spirit in which the whole correspondence alluded to was conducted on the part of the Wesleyan Missionary Board of Upper Canada.

Again, Mr. Alder informs your Lordship "that when the Wesleyan Missionary Committee took upon itself to support the Indian Missions, the various sums raised by the Upper Canada Conference amounted to the small sum of £177 18s. 1d. sterling, since which time they have gradually increased to £1,304 14s. 11d."

Now, my Lord, in reference to this, as well as in respect to the statements of Mr. Alder above noticed, and those which we shall hereafter notice, we appeal, not to any authority got up for the occasion, but to official papers, and documents, and reports which were prepared and published at the time the occurrences referred to took place. We herewith enclose the printed annual reports of the Wesleyan Missionary Society of Upper Canada from 1832 to 1839 inclusive. These reports, since 1833, have been prepared by and printed under the supervision of the Rev. Mr. Stinson, the London Society's representative and agent in Upper Canada.

The Wesleyan Missionary Committee assumed the responsibility of supporting the Missions in Upper Canada in October, 1833. By the accompanying printed report for the year ending October, 1833, (p. 16,) it will be seen that, so far from Mr. Alder's statement having the slightest foundation in fact, the "various sums raised by the Upper Canada Conference for missionary purposes" that year amounted to £1,322 19s. 4d.; £1,038 18s. 5d. of which were collected in Upper Canada, and the remaining £203 0s. 11d. were collected in various parts of the United States—at a time when a more neighborly feeling existed between the two countries than at present. During the next year (the first year of the union between the British and Canadian Conferences) the missionary subscriptions and collections in Upper Canada fell off from £1,038 18s. 5d. to £198 5s. 8½d. (see Report ending October, 1834, p. 18.) This falling off was caused by dissatisfactions which grew out of the union—a falling off of more than five hundred per cent. instead of an increase, as most erroneously stated by Mr. Alder. And in exact proportion as the ministers and official organ of the Wesleyan Methodist Church in Canada succeeded to reconcile their congregations to the union, did the missionary funds collected in that province revive again and increase. Hence, by the accompanying printed reports, it will be seen that, in 1835, the amount raised in Upper Canada for missionary purposes was £512 3s. 2½d.; in 1836, £1,192 9s. 1d.; in 1837, £1,205 2s. 0½.; in 1838, £959 19s. 3d.; in 1839, £1,449 14s. 11½d. It was during this last Missionary year that Mr. Ryerson conducted the Weekly organ of the Wesleyan Methodist Church in Upper Canada—exerted the most influence over the views and feelings of its members—and excited most strongly the opposition of the Wesleyan Missionary Committee in London.

Mr. Alder attributes whatever increase has of late years taken place in the missionary funds raised in Upper Canada, to the exertions of the London Society's representative, and the peculiar and exclusive influence of the Wesleyan Conference in England. How much credit is due to this statement may be judged from the facts, that the Wesleyan Conference in England and its Representative in Upper Canada, existed in 1834 and 1835, as well as in 1836, 1837, 1838, and 1839; that the ministers of the Methodist Church in Upper Canada have been the treasurers and promoters of the funds of the Missionary Society; that the annual Missionary meetings, &c., have been held in the chapels and congregations established by the Canadian Conference; and that the collectors and principal contributors are members of the Wesleyan Missionary Church in Canada.

Mr. Alder furthermore adds, "that the Wesleyan Missionary Society were instrumental in saving the Indian Missions in Upper Canada from ruin;" that "when the Wesleyan Missionary committee took upon itself the respon-

sibility of supporting those Missions, the buildings were found to be to a great extent in a dilapidated state, debts were due on them; and very large sums were of necessity expended in placing them in anything like a state of efficiency."

It is true, that when the Wesleyan Missionary Society in Canada became Auxiliary to the Society in London, it was in debt £295 14s. 6d. currency. But is it anything new for a benevolent Society to be in its operations in advance of its funds? The London Wesleyan Missionary Society is at this moment in advance of its funds to the amount of £20,000 sterling.

By the accompanying printed Missionary reports, it will be seen, that in 1831, the Wesleyan Missionary Society in Upper Canada was £204 1s. 9d. in advance of its funds; but that in 1832 it not only paid off its debts, but had a surplus of £129 7s. 5½d; though in 1833, it was again in advance of its funds to the amount of £295 14s. 6d., at which time it became auxiliary to the Wesleyan Missionary Society in London.

In respect to the "dilapidated state of the buildings," and "the very large sums which were necessary to put them in anything like a state of efficiency," a reference to the Report of the London Society's Agent for 1834, will satisfy your lordship whether there is any reason for this statement of Mr. Alder, any more than for those already adverted to. From that Report it appears, that, during the first year after the London Society assumed the responsibility of supporting the Missions in Upper Canada, there was expended in *repairing* Mission and school-houses, £41 4s. 2d. currency; in finishing one Mission-House, and one chapel already commenced, £149 8s. 5d.; for materials for two new school-houses, £18 6s. 0; materials for one new Mission-House, £19 10s. By referring to the Reports for the two years immediately preceding, it will be seen that there was expended, under the same heads, a larger sum than is made by Mr. Alder the ground of imputation and of self-exaltation.

As to the results of the management of the Indian Missions in Upper Canada by the London Society, it may be observed, that all those missions, except the one at St. Clair, had been established by the Canada Conference during the eight years preceding the Union in 1833, at which time there were upwards of 1000 Indians in church-communion; and about 400 children in the Mission-schools. Now there are about 850 Indians in Upper Canada in church-communion, and about 250 children in the Mission-schools. (See Reports.) In the Wesleyan Methodist Church in Canada at large, there was, during the seven years immediately preceding the Union an increase of 9,164 members; during the seven years since the Union there has been an increase of only 316 members.

Mr. Alder says, "The suspension of the government grant for two or three years *did* affect our Canadian Missions, as we were thereby prevented from increasing the number of our agents amongst the Indians and destitute settlers." On this point also, my Lord, we appeal to the printed Reports of the Society's agent, and the stations of Missionaries in Upper Canada. The grant was reduced in 1834, and wholly suspended during the years 1835-37. By the official reports of the stations of missionaries in Upper Canada, it appears there were stationed in 1833, at the time the grant of £900 was made, 11 missionaries; in 1834, 13; in 1835, 14; in 1836, 16; in 1837, 17; in 1838, 18; in 1839, 17; in 1840, 16. So that the number of missionaries now employed in Upper Canada is precisely the same as it was in 1836, before the grant was restored, and two less than it was in 1833.

Mr. Alder informs your lordship that from August, 1833, to December, 1839, there has been expended by the Wesleyan Missionary Society (including £8,659 16s. 5d. obtained in Upper Canada) in connexion with the Missions in Upper Canada, the sum of £17,806 18s. 11d. sterling.

Now, in the printed Reports of the Society's agent in Upper Canada, embracing the same period, the total amount reported to have been expended in that Province, in connexion with the Missions, is £13,475 1s. 4d. sterling;

£4,331 17s. 7d. less than the sum stated by Mr. Alder. The manner in which this sum of £4,331 17s. 7d. sterling has been expended has not been stated in the Society's Reports, either in London or in Canada. It remains for Mr. Alder to explain.

The agent of the London Society in Upper Canada states, in his printed Annual Reports, the expenditure of £13,475 1s. 4d. sterling. From Mr. Alder's own showing, £8659 16s. 5d. sterling of that amount have been obtained in that Province—£3,670 from the Government, and £4,989 16s. 5d. from the members and friends of the Wesleyan Methodist Church in Canada.

In addition to this, let it be observed, my Lord, that there have been built by the ministers and members of the Wesleyan Methodist Church in Canada during the same period to which Mr. Alder refers, upwards of 40 chapels, and 20 parsonage houses, besides the support of the ministry. The entire amount of expenditure during that period cannot be stated or ascertained; but your lordship may form some tolerable conception of it, when we state, from official returns, that during the last year, there has been raised for the support of the Methodist ministry in Upper Canada the sum of £5,006 11s. 6½d. exclusive of £1,449 14s. 11½d. for missionary purposes, and large sums for the building of chapels and parsonages, keeping chapels and parsonages in repair, warmed, lighted, &c. The amount of deficiencies in making up the moderate disciplinary salaries and allowances of the Wesleyan ministers in Upper Canada during the year is £1,119 11s. 6½d. The loss of the amount of all such deficiencies must be endured by the individual ministers concerned, until the funds of the Church in Canada are sufficient to supply them. The Wesleyan Missionary Society is not responsible for them. It is also worthy of remark, that, whilst there are only sixteen Missionaries stationed in Upper Canada, there are 111 stationed preachers on circuits, who are excluded, by the Articles of Union, from all claims upon the funds of the Wesleyan Conference in England, and in whose congregations missionary subscriptions and collections are annually raised in aid of the funds of the London Society.

In reply to Mr. Alder's oft-repeated statement, that both Mr. Ryerson and the Canada Conference had repeatedly declared "that it is wrong for churches to receive aid for religious purposes from the state," we may observe, that it is utterly unsupported by evidence, and contradicted by numerous facts. In 1834 and 1835, Mr. Ryerson, as the editor of the official organ of the Wesleyan Conference in Canada, defended, at large, the right of the crown to appropriate, and the right of churches to receive aid from the casual and territorial revenue. In 1838, 1839, and 1840, Mr. Ryerson, in the same capacity, defended and supported measures for the division of the annual proceeds of the Clergy Reserves amongst various Christian denominations in Upper Canada. In June, 1837, the Wesleyan Conference in Canada adopted resolutions with a view to the division of the proceeds of the Reserves; in January, 1838, the ministers of the Wesleyan Methodist church in Canada published a plan of conciliation and concession for the settlement of the Clergy Reserve question, from which we quote the following passages:—"With a view to an equitable division of the Reserves among different denominations, for purposes of religious and moral instruction in such a way as will not contravene the disciplinary regulations of any religious body, we most respectfully submit, that the most equitable method would be, to allow the claims of each denomination in proportion to the sums which they raise and expend, in the province, annually, for religious purposes. Having thus, after the example of the clergy of the churches of England and Scotland, and without any desire to dictate, expressed our views on this important question, we deem it but just to ourselves and the public, to explain, in conclusion, the position which we, as a body of ministers, occupy in respect to it. We stand upon common ground, and possess a common interest with the members of our church generally; and purpose to

apply whatever public aid may be acquired, by a fair and honourable division of the Reserves, to assist the members of our community in erecting *chapels and parsonages*, and in bringing the means of a sound *religious and literary* education within the reach of the largest possible number of the youth of our congregations. In thus continuing to content ourselves with the limited support which arises from the free-will offerings of Christian liberality, and availing ourselves of every means which Providence may place at our disposal, to aid the beloved subjects of our pastoral care, and to promote the religious and moral instruction of the country, we believe the claims of the Wesleyan Methodist church will not suffer from a comparison with those of any other church in the Province."

It is true that the Wesleyan Conference in Canada have always preferred the appropriation of the Reserves to purposes of education on Christian principles; but they have done so, not on any theoretical grounds, as stated by Mr. Alder, but upon grounds arising out of the peculiar circumstances and the divided state of public opinion in Upper Canada; but they have always manifested a readiness to accede to, to support and defend any equitable division of the Reserves whenever it has been proposed by the authorities of the country.

It will be observed from the above quoted passages, that the Wesleyan ministers in Canada have expressed their intention of applying whatever portion of the proceeds of the Clergy Reserves may be placed at their disposal to other religious purposes than their own individual support. They have done so, not from mere theory, but—1. Because it accords most with the prevailing views and feelings of the members of the Wesleyan Methodist church in Canada. 2. Because it is in perfect harmony with the opinions expressed by the imperial government when the grants were first made to the religious bodies in 1832, as will appear in the sequel.

Mr. Alder states that Earl Grey's government was induced by *patriotic* as well as religious considerations, to offer aid to the Wesleyan Missionary Committee, in 1832, in order to promote their operations in Upper Canada. Whatever feelings may have been excited in the minds of his late Majesty's government by misrepresentations against the ministers of the Methodist church in Upper Canada, the conduct of those devoted men has long since furnished an ample refutation of the calumnies which had for many years been insinuated by the tongue of jealousy and selfishness, into the ear of Royalty against them.—Such an insinuation comes with an exceedingly ill grace from Mr. Alder, after the manner in which he has been treated by them, and after he himself has been compelled, in a communication which was published in the Upper Canada Christian Guardian, 29th of May, 1839, to bear the following testimony to their character and labours:—"I admire the zeal and self-denial of those noble men belonging to your connexion in Upper Canada, who, from the first settlement of the country, have been 'in labours more abundant,' and to whom that Province owes a debt of gratitude, which it can never repay, for their untiring efforts to evangelize that portion of the vineyard of the Lord of hosts."

Mr. Alder has again and again assumed and stated, that the Royal word is pledged to the continuance of the Government grant in its present form to the Wesleyan committee. On this point the Earl of Ripon, in his letter to Lord Glenelg, dated Carlton Gardens, 4th April, 1836, states—"of course I could give them no specific pledge as to the duration of such assistance, which might be affected by various considerations beyond my control." His lordship, however, adds, that it was his impression at the time the grant was made to the missionary committee, "that the same *motives of policy* which dictated the original grant, would recommend its continuance." If those "*motives of policy*" were the strengthening of the administration of government in Canada, they have by no means been realised, and, least of all, are they realised at the present time; for the Secretaries of the Wesleyan Missionary Society are known to be opposed to the Canadian, as well as the domestic policy of Her

Majesty's Government; the "Watchman" newspaper,* which is conducted under the supervision of the Missionary Secretaries and other leading Wesleyan ministers in London, excites any thing but a respectful and friendly feeling towards the Government in the minds of all those persons in Canada who are in any way influenced by the opinions of the London committee; and the Representatives of the committee (the Rev. Messrs. Stinson and Richey) in Canada have, in the entire circle of their personal intercourse and influence, opposed the policy and measures of the Governor General of Canada, and have not even spared His Excellency's personal character—facts which consist within the knowledge of the undersigned, and in proof of which abundant evidence is adducible. Indeed we are able to state, upon unquestionable authority, that the district meeting, or conference of Wesleyan Missionaries in Lower Canada, from opposition to the character and policy of the Governor General, desisted, at their last annual meeting, from presenting to His Excellency the usual respectful and loyal address which they had been accustomed to present to each of his predecessors on their assumption of the Government of Canada.—At the same time, it is not unknown to your Lordship, that His Excellency the Governor General has received every support and aid it was in the power of the organ and ministers and friends of the Wesleyan Methodist church to give him in his noble and untiring efforts to tranquillize the public mind in Canada—to break down party spirit and party distinctions—and to carry out the policy of Her Majesty's ministers, with the view of establishing an improved and more liberal and more efficient system of Government in Canada.

The objects for which this grant was originally made to the Missionary Committee deserve special notice. Whatever arrangements may have been made with the Lt. Governors of Upper Canada, it is clear that the Imperial Government intended this grant to be applied, not for the payment of the salaries of missionaries, but for the erection of chapels and parsonages. The Earl of Ripon, in his Despatch to Sir John Colborne, dated 25th of October, 1832, says—"With this view, I am to request that you will transmit to me at the beginning of each year, a statement of the mode in which you would propose that the money which it is intended to apply to religious purposes should be distributed; and in preparing such a scheme you will of course bear in mind the principles on which you have already been directed to act, namely, that you will endeavour to give assistance to the religious denominations *as much as possible*, by building for them in situations where they can command congregations, *chapels and parsonage houses*, as I am of opinion that money may be *much more advantageously applied to these objects than in paying salaries.*" And in the very despatch, dated Nov. 12, 1832, in which his Lordship authorises Sir John Colborne to make the first grant of £900 to the Missionary Committee, Lord Ripon says—"I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of

(From the London Edition.)

* *Note by E. Ryerson.*—I never said the *Watchman* was the organ of the *Wesleyan Conference*, as the resolutions of the London Committee would intimate. I have stated that it was published under the supervision of the leading members of the *Wesleyan Conference*. When the *Watchman* was started, it was introduced to the public by the editor of the *Wesleyan Methodist Magazine* as an "organ" of the *Wesleyan Connexion*; (see "*Christian Retrospect*" in the *Magazine* for February, 1835;) and the circumstances relative to its publication and management are, as I have reason to know, as follows: 1. The means to establish and carry it on have been furnished by laymen. 2. But in the articles of their association, it is provided, (1) That the profits of the paper, after paying the interest of the money invested in its publication, shall be applied to Methodist Connexional Funds; (2) That the Missionary Secretaries, Editor of the *Magazine*, and, I believe, the members of the *Wesleyan Book Committee* generally, shall be *ex officio* members of the Committee to superintend the publication of the *Watchman*. By mutual agreement, certain members of that Committee have been wont to meet weekly to revise the editorial and selected articles of the *Watchman*: and they have not unfrequently written editorial articles for it, as well as modified at their pleasure those which had been written by the ostensible lay-editors. How far, therefore, the *Watchman* is official, or not official in its character, every man can judge for himself.

your despatch of the 5th September last, proposing an arrangement for the payment of the church of England Missionaries in the province of Upper Canada, and for affording aid to the Presbyterians, *Wesleyan Methodists*, and Roman Catholics, to *build churches and chapels.*" Believing such to have been the design of the grant, the Wesleyan Conference in Canada have more than once applied for aid in behalf of poor and needy chapels erecting or in debt, but their applications have been as often rejected by the agents of the Committee.

Mr. Alder has stated several times, very emphatically, that the grant was made to the Missionary Committee before the union between the English and Canada Conferences was contemplated, and wholly independent of that arrangement. Of the preliminary and private conversations which may have taken place between Members of Government and members of the Missionary Committee, we know nothing; our appeal is to official documents; and we presume that neither the Earl of Ripon nor Lord Seaton will contradict what they themselves have stated some years since on this subject.

During the years 1834 and 1835, much discussion took place in Upper Canada relative to this appropriation to the Wesleyan Missionary Committee. A Wesleyan minister in Upper Canada—the Rev. A. Green—addressed a letter to Sir John Colborne, inquiring whether it was intended for the Wesleyan body in England or in Canada. His Excellency's answer, through his Secretary Colonel Rowan, will be found in the Appendix to the accompanying printed Report on Religious Grants, p. 28, dated "Government House, Toronto, 30th June, 1835." Sir John Colborne directs Colonel Rowan to state to Mr. Green—"At the time the appropriation alluded to in your communication was made, His Majesty's Government supposed the Wesleyan Methodists in this Province were under the control of the British Conference." In reply to a letter from Lord Glenelg on this subject, the Earl of Ripon, in a letter dated Carlton Gardens, 4th April, 1836, states as follows:—"It is correctly stated that I had various communications with the Wesleyan Methodist Society in this country in the year 1832, upon the subject of their operations in Upper Canada, and of the desire entertained by the Wesleyans in the Province to place themselves in close and continuous connexion with the Parent Society in England. In the course of these communications I became so impressed with the importance of the objects which the Society, both at Home and in Canada had in view, that I thought it expedient to encourage their exertions, and to instruct the Governor to give them some pecuniary assistance from those funds which were legally at the disposal of the Crown."

We know not, my Lord, how language can be more explicit, and testimony more conclusive than this. It is perfectly clear, therefore, that when the appropriation was made, the Government supposed there was or would be an identity of interest as well as of administration between the Wesleyan bodies in Upper Canada and in England.

Mr. Alder says, indeed, that the arrangements with Lord Seaton in respect to the grant were completed at Toronto "about a year before the Union between the British Conference and the Conference in Upper Canada took place. This we do not dispute; but Mr. Alder withholds from your Lordship essential parts of that affair. The union was agreed to on the part of the British Conference in August 1833, and on the part of the Conference in Upper Canada in the following October. But the Canada Conference had proposed certain Articles of Union in August 1832. Those proposed articles of union contemplated a unity of interest as well as of jurisdiction, between the two bodies. They were published in Toronto on the 29th of August, 1832, in the official organ of the Canada Conference; Sir John Colborne's despatch Lord Ripon, recommending this very grant, was dated the 5th September following. And that Mr. Alder himself, at that time, not only contemplated union between the two bodies, but such a union as would give the Canada Co

ference a claim upon the funds of the British Conference, will appear obvious from the following extract of a communication, which (on leaving) Mr. Alder addressed to the Canada Conference on the several points respecting which he conceived their then appointed representative to England should be instructed to confer and decide. Mr. Alder's communication is dated "Kingston (U. C.) August 16, 1832." The passage relating to the subject now under discussion is as follows :—

"That the [London] Committee shall be at liberty to appoint such persons to labour in connexion with this [Canada] Conference, as they may deem to be properly qualified for the sacred office, and that the Conference will not multiply *preachers* or *CIRCUITS* *within its boundaries* until they shall have corresponded with the Committee. *This is asked on the ground*, as the Committee is expected to grant an *annual sum of money* for the *support and extension* of the work in *Canada*, they ought to be associated with the Conference in determining how *many preachers* shall be *employed*, that *their funds* may not be *embarrassed*, nor the *necessary comforts of the preachers* be diminished by the employment of a greater number of ministers than the *means placed at your disposal* will justify."

Here, your Lordship will observe, that, independent of the Aboriginal Indian Missions, Mr. Alder not only did contemplate a union between the Wesleyan Conferences in England and in Canada, but such a union as would place at the disposal of the Canada Conference an annual sum commensurate with the wants of the Canadian preachers on the *circuits*; but subsequently to this, and subsequent to the arrangement with the Government above alluded to in the extracts of letters from Lords Ripon and Seaton, Mr. Alder and his friends in London introduced a preliminary clause into the articles of union, previously to their adoption by the British Conference in August 1833, to "secure the funds of the English Conference against any claims on the part of the Canadian preachers."

It was this anomalous peculiarity in the Articles of Union which, we have reason to believe, attracted the particular attention of the Governor General of Canada, and convinced His Excellency, in connexion with other circumstances, that the grant to the Committee, in its present mode of control and application, was not only invidious and unjust to the Wesleyan Conference in Canada, but at variance with the comprehensive objects contemplated by the Government when it was made, and calculated to excite dissatisfaction and opposition on the part of the ministers and members of the Wesleyan Methodist Church in Canada against the Government, rather than to secure their grateful esteem and affectionate support.

Mr. Alder dwells much upon the circumstance that both the Canada Conference and Mr. Ryerson had always admitted the exclusive right of the Missionary Committee to the control of the grant. This is very true, and for two reasons. 1. Neither the Canada Conference nor Mr. Ryerson was aware of all the circumstances connected with the grant until after the investigation of them by the Governor-General. 2. The grant had always been paid out of the casual and territorial revenue, with the appropriations of which the Canada Conference had always felt and declared it had no right to interfere, confining its discussions to the question of the Clergy Reserves, and its claims to whatever advantages might arise to the Wesleyan Methodist Church in Canada from an equitable settlement of that question.

But now, my Lord, the affair assumes a very different aspect from what it has heretofore presented. It is proposed to relieve the casual and territorial revenue from the annual payment of this, as well as of other religious grants, and to transfer it as one of the primary charges upon the Clergy Reserves fund; an act, which, if it take place without varying the distribution and control of the grant in question, must, during the next fifty years at least, debar the ministers and members of the Wesleyan Methodist Church in Canada from the *slightest benefit* of the settlement of the Clergy Reserve question. The Wesleyan

Methodist Church in Canada has not complained of the exercise of the Royal prerogative, though it has been altogether overlooked in the distribution of annual grants which have been made to the Wesleyan Committee in London, and to four other Christian denominations in Upper Canada; but it will have just and permanent cause for strong dissatisfaction and complaint, should it be deprived of any advantages in the settlement of the Clergy Reserves in which other churches in Canada largely participate. We cannot but view with astonishment the efforts on the part of Mr. Alder and his friends—whose operations in Upper Canada are limited to the last seven years—to grasp every farthing of a disposable *Canadian* revenue from their brethren in Canada, whose labours in that country reach over the last half century, who have endured privations and labours unexcelled in any country or in any section of the Christian church during that period, and who have contributed more than any other one religious community to elevate Upper Canada to its present comparatively advanced state of moral fruitfulness and religious intelligence. We cannot persuade ourselves that Her Majesty's Government can be induced to countenance a policy so manifestly unjust, unreasonable, and impolitic.

Mr. Alder has misrepresented several resolutions and proceedings of the Wesleyan Conference in Canada; but after so long an intrusion upon your Lordship's time and attention, we feel that it would be improper for us to detain your Lordship any longer with the discussion of the minor details of Mr. Alder's letter.

We deem it our duty, however, in conclusion, to apprise your Lordship that, since we received from Mr. Under-Secretary Smith a copy of Mr. Alder's letter, the Wesleyan Conference in England has (on Friday last) rescinded, as far as its own act could do it, the Articles of Union which have heretofore, since 1832, existed between the Conference in England and the Conference in Upper Canada. Until the dissolution shall have been agreed to by the Canada Conference, the English Conference in Upper Canada must stand in the relation of a *seceding body*. All the itinerant ministers in Upper Canada, both in the missions and on the Circuits, with one exception, are members of the Canada Conference, and not of the British Conference. All the Aboriginal Indian Missions in Upper Canada, with one exception, were established by the Canada Conference before the union. By the 5th of the accompanying resolutions, marked E, your Lordship will perceive that the Canada Conference has resolved to retain the direction of those missions. Whether the Conference in England will prosecute its operations in U. Canada hereafter, or leave that Province to the Canada Conference, we are not yet apprised. In either alternative the conclusion appears to us to be the same—that the body whose pastoral headship is in the country, whose feelings, and interests, and hopes are bound up in it, are entitled to the protection and consideration of the Government of the country.

We have the honour to be,
 (Signed) WILLIAM RYERSON,
 EGERTON RYERSON,

Representatives of the Conference of the Wesleyan Methodist Church in Canada.

[*Note.*—All the letters and documents referred to in the foregoing communication will be found in the preceding pages.

S U P P L E M E N T .

EXTRACTS OF CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN THE ENGLISH AND AMERICAN CONFERENCES, FROM 1816 TO 1820, RELATIVE TO THE CANADAS—ESPECIALLY LOWER CANADA.

[Bishop ASBURY, the author of the first of the following papers, was sent from England by Mr. Wesley, and appointed by Mr. Wesley as joint Superintendent with Dr. Coke, over the Methodist Societies in America.]

Extracts from a Letter from Bishop Asbury to the Rev. Joseph Benson, dated January 15, 1816.

"We have planted, we have watered, we have taken a most sacred charge of Upper and Lower Canada for about 22 years. They form two respectable districts in the Genessee Conference. They lie side by side on the northern banks of the St. Lawrence, and the U. S. districts and circuits on the South. The souls of our people in Canada are exceedingly precious to us. They are a willing people, prompt to pay their preachers; they say "tell us what to do and we will do it." Exclusive of the most ancient, who came from various parts of Europe, the additional and increasing inhabitants now of both provinces are multitudes of refugees from the U. States, at the time of the revolution. Many others have preferred the provinces to the U. States, and there are at this time large family connexions on both sides of the line, and many preachers who have changed and interchanged.

"We, as Ministers of Christ, think it a sin of sins to divide the body of Christ. There was a special caution given to Thomas Burch, Samuel Montgomery, and Henry Ryan; and we have good reason to believe that possibly two-thirds of the Society in Montreal would put themselves under the government of the American Connexion. But we shall bear long, suffer long, make every explanation, till the charge is given up to us. Whether the thing has been done through ignorance, or the influence of wicked and designing men, we shall give our fathers and brethren time to inform themselves and time to correct their conduct; for we are sure that our Episcopacy could never act so out of order as to send a preacher to take possession of a charge so consequential, under the oversight of the Parent Connexion. And yet, in this business, we would touch that venerable Body, or any authoritative part of it, with the tenderness of a feather dipt in oil."

Copy of a Letter sent by order of the General Conference, 1816, to the London Methodist Missionary Society in England.

"Baltimore, May 22nd, 1816.

"DEAR BRETHREN,—Before your Address to Bishop Asbury arrived, that venerable man of God was no more, having departed this life in the triumphs of faith, on the 31st of March last, in Spottsylvania County, in Virginia. He travelled and laboured till within a few days of his death, and will be long remembered with the most lively gratitude by the thousands in our country who have been blessed by his ministry.

"We rejoice to hear of the extension of the Redeemer's kingdom among you, and by your missionary efforts in distant places: may the time speedily come when the uttermost parts of the earth shall be given to Him for his possession. We have had the pleasure of receiving our esteemed friends and brethren, Messrs. Black and Bennett, your Representatives to this General Conference, with whom we have conferred on the state of our Societies in the Canadas; and, after the most mature deliberation, and considering the subject in all its bearings, we have finally concluded that we cannot, consistently with our duty to those Societies, give up any part of them, or of our chapels in those Provinces, to the Superintendence of the British Connexion. The reasons which have led us to this conclusion we will briefly state, and leave you our Christian Brethren to judge of their sufficiency:

"1st. Missionaries were first sent into those Provinces from the United States, who, through great labours and various sufferings, were instrumental in spreading the Gospel, and raising Societies in almost every part of them where the English language was spoken.

"2nd. We have continued in these labours and sufferings, and the charge of those Societies for upwards of twenty years, until we have formed twelve Circuits, in which there are eleven chapels, which have been regularly supplied

with Preachers from the U. States, some of whom have been almost entirely supported from our funds.

"3rd. If an application were made, in time of the late unhappy war, to the British Connexion for a Preacher to be sent to Montreal, yet it is believed, from evidence before us, that that application was made in a private and unofficial manner, by a few individuals, without the knowledge of the Preacher who was then stationed there, or of a majority of the Society; and if any application were made previously, we had no knowledge of it; and had you been apprised of these circumstances, we believe you would not have sent a Preacher to that place.

"4th. It appears evident, from various sources of information, that notwithstanding such application, at least half of the Society in that place at present, and a vast majority of the members on the circuits in the two Provinces earnestly desire us still to continue in our Pastoral charge of them; and, although we feel truly thankful to our friends in Great Britain, for their generous aid towards building the chapel and parsonage in Montreal, to which you have alluded in your Address, yet we cannot suppose that that circumstance entitles the British Connexion to a claim on those houses, inasmuch as it is presumed that their aid was granted under an expectation that they were to be under the superintendency and control of the M. E. Church in America, as the Society in Montreal then were, and agreeably to the Deed of Trust; and, if we supposed it proper to take this ground, we think it would not be difficult for us to make out an equal, if not a superior claim from the sum collected in the U. States for the same purpose; but this we do not urge.

"The above reasons, Dear Brethren, have induced us to believe it to be our duty to continue our ministerial labours in the Canadian Provinces; but the most forcible of them all with us, is, the declared wish of a great majority of our brethren there to continue under our Ministry. This wish, however, we are satisfied, does not proceed from any opposition or want of affection to their brethren in Europe, but from the greater ease and certainty with which they think they can be supplied by us, in consequence of our contiguity to them, and from their attachments to us, as their spiritual fathers in the Gospel; and indeed we do consider them as our spiritual children; and if we seem to be unwilling to give up the charge of them, do not, Dear Brethren, think it strange: the tie is strong. We trust you cannot, you will not entertain an idea that, in our decision on this subject, we have been in the least influenced by any considerations of temporal profit or ease: if we had, our decision would have been very different. Our one object is the salvation of souls, as yours also, we doubt not is; and we most sincerely hope and pray that this affair may not have any tendency to diminish in the least that Christian affection and harmony which have hitherto so long and so happily subsisted between us. We rejoice in our relation to you as Brethren; and your great and constant efforts to spread the Gospel of our common salvation, stimulate us to a holy emulation.

"Our two brethren, your delegates, have stated that they are not authorized to withdraw the Missionary from Montreal without farther instructions from you. If this were done, there would be no difficulty, we think, of an amicable settlement; and, we flatter ourselves, that when you have duly weighed the above reasons, you will not hesitate to direct this measure. The unhappy division of the Society in that place has been to us a source of great pain; whatever causes have produced that lamentable event, we wish to be buried in oblivion, and to strive in future to heal the breach, and restore peace and unity to that afflicted Society.

"Such, very Dear Brethren, are our views of this business; and although we have not felt ourselves at liberty to accede to the proposals of your Representatives, yet we trust they have had no cause to doubt our brotherly respect and affection both for you and them; and we gladly avail ourselves of this opportunity to assure you that, in all things, their deportment among us has been

such as becomes the Ministers of Christ, and their gospel labours a blessing both to us and our people.

“That the Great Head of the Church may overrule all things for the general good, and endue us all with all heavenly graces, and bring us, at last, to inherit eternal life together, is, Dear Brethren, the ardent prayer of your American Brethren.”

[Signed by the Bishops, by Order and in behalf of the Conference.]

Resolutions of the British Conference [somewhere between 1816 and 1820.]

“1st. That three additional Missionaries shall be sent to the Canadas.

“2nd. That a Missionary from England shall continue to be stationed at Montreal.

“3rd. That unless the American Conference, in consideration of the assistance received from England toward the erection of the Montreal chapel, shall voluntarily agree to allow the use of the chapel and the adjoining premises to our Missionary and the Society in connexion with him, we recommend to our friends quietly to resign the premises to the American brethren, and to procure other accommodations for themselves.

“4th. That, except in the peculiar case of Montreal, our Missionaries shall be instructed not to occupy any station actually occupied by our American Brethren, but to employ their labours in those parts of the two Provinces which are most destitute of the means of instruction and salvation; and not to neglect, in connexion with this object, any Providential opportunity which may offer to them of contributing their efforts toward the conversion of the Indian tribes in that neighbourhood.

“5th. That we earnestly recommend to our Missionaries and Societies in Canada, carefully to avoid all disputation, and to cultivate a spirit of brotherly affection toward those of the American Preachers and their Societies in that country with whom they may have to do.

“6th. That the Secretaries of the Mission Committee be directed to communicate these resolutions to the American Brethren, and to assure them, that in continuing to occupy Montreal as one of our stations, we are actuated by a conviction of imperative duty, and sincerely regret that there should be even the appearance of collision and separation between the two Connexions. That it was not intended to urge the American Preachers to any abandonment of their Canadian circuits and stations in general, but that the application chiefly respected the particular case of Montreal; and that we are not without hope, that in that one instance the American Conference will yet see it right to make some concessions to our wishes for the sake of peace, and in order to put an end to the unpleasant state of things which now exists at Montreal.”

**RESOLUTIONS OF THE WESLEYAN CONFERENCE IN ENGLAND
IN 1820, AGAINST INTERFERING WITH UPPER CANADA.**

[It is known that the first regular Methodist Preachers in the Provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, as well as in Upper and Lower Canada, were sent from Conferences in the United States, in accordance with the wishes of Mr. Wesley and Dr. Coke. The Societies in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick were, in a short time, supplied with Preachers from England; but the Societies in the Canadas continued under the care of the United States Conference until 1820—in Upper Canada until 1821. For a number of years most of the Preachers who labored in the Canadas were Americans; but as it was a rule with the United States Conference to employ all British subjects who could

be obtained as Preachers in the Canadas, the greater part of the Canada Conference became at length composed of Preachers who had been born and brought up in the British dominions. Every member of the Canada Conference at the present time is a bona fide British subject. But this was not the case in 1820, when the Wesleyan Conference in England agreed to leave Upper Canada to be wholly supplied by the United States Conference. The principles which the English Conference then laid down as the ground of that arrangement are *unchangeable*; but how do they condemn, in tones solemn and awful, the *changeable* proceedings of the London Wesleyan Committee in now interfering with the work in Upper Canada! If the principles which the Wesleyan Conference in England embodied and avowed as Methodistic and sacred in every part of the world, induced them to leave Upper Canada in 1820 under a *foreign ecclesiastical jurisdiction*, how do the Committee in London stand condemned by their own previously avowed principles, and how must their proceedings be reprobated by every honorable mind, in breaking the bonds of Methodistic unity in Upper Canada in 1840, and in attempting to establish separate congregations here, when the Societies are under the jurisdiction of a *British Conference within the Province*! We will insert the proceedings and resolutions of the Wesleyan Conference in England without further note or comment. We copy them from the third volume of Dr. Bangs' History of the M. E. Church in America, recently published.]

*Extract from the Address of the Wesleyan Conference in England in 1820,
"To the General Superintendents of the Methodist Episcopal Church in
the United States of America."*

"The resolutions on the disputes in the Canadas were adopted after a calm and patient consideration of the case, in which we were greatly assisted by Mr. Emory. We hope that they will lead to a full adjustment of those disputes, and that the affection which exists between the two connections generally will extend itself to the brethren and societies in the Canadas. This is the disposition which we shall earnestly inculcate upon those under our care in those provinces, and we have full confidence that the same care will be taken by you to extinguish every feeling contrary to love among those over whom you have control and influence.

"With earnest prayers for you, dear and honored brethren, in particular, on whom devolve the general direction of the affairs of the great body of Methodists in the western world, and labors so severe, but so glorious,—that you may be filled with wisdom for counsel, and strength to fulfil the duties of your great office;—and also praying that all your churches may have rest, and walking in the fear of the Lord, and in the comforts of the Holy Ghost, be abundantly multiplied, we are, dear brethren, yours most affectionately in Christ Jesus,

"JABEZ BUNTING, *President*,
GEORGE MARSDEN, *Secretary*."

"*Liverpool, August, 1820.*"

*Resolutions of the Conference referred to in the above extract from the
Address to the American Conference.*

"On the subject of the unpleasant circumstances which have occurred in the Canadas between the American preachers and our missionaries, referred to the conference by the missionary committee in London, with their opinion that Upper Canada shall be left in possession of the American brethren, and

that our missionary exertions shall be confined to the Lower Province, this committee recommend to the conference the adoption of the following principles and arrangements:—

"1. That, as the American Methodists and ourselves are but one body, it would be inconsistent with our unity, and dangerous to that affection which ought to characterize us in every place, to have different societies and congregations in the same towns and villages, or to allow of any intrusion on either side into each other's labors.

"2. That this principle shall be the rule by which the disputes now existing in the Canadas, between our missionaries, shall be terminated.

"3. That the simplest and most effectual manner of carrying this rule into effect appears to us to be, to accede to the suggestion of the American conference, that the American brethren shall have the occupation of Upper Canada, and the British missionaries that of Lower Canada, allowing sufficient time for carrying this arrangement into effect, with all possible tenderness to existing prejudices and conflicting interests on both sides; the arrangement to be completed within a period to be fixed as early as possible by the missionary committee. But should insuperable difficulties occur in the attempt to execute this plan, (which, however, we do not anticipate,) either party shall be at liberty to propose any other mode of accommodation which shall assume as its basis the great principle laid down in the first of these resolutions, and which we are of opinion should be held most sacred in every part of the world.

"4. That if hereafter it shall appear to any of our brethren there, either British missionaries or American preachers, that any place on either side the boundary line, now mentioned, needs religious help, and presents a favorable opportunity for usefulness, the case shall be referred by the Canada district meeting to the General Conference, or by that body to the Canada district; and if either shall formally decline to supply the place on their own side the boundary, then the other shall be at liberty to supply the said place, without being deemed to have violated the terms of this friendly compact.

"5. And it shall be explicitly understood in this arrangement, that each party shall be bound to supply with preachers all those stations and their dependencies which shall be relinquished by each of the connections, that no place on either side shall sustain any loss of the ordinances of religion in consequence of this arrangement.

"5. That the missionary committee be directed to address a letter to the private and official members, trustees, &c., under the care of our missionaries in Upper Canada, informing them of the judgment of the conference, and affectionately and earnestly advising them to put themselves and their chapels under the pastoral care of the American preachers, with the suggestion of such considerations, to incline them to it, as the committee may judge most proper.

"7. That the bishops of the American connection shall direct a similar letter to the private and official members, trustees, &c., under the care of the American preachers in the province of Lower Canada, requesting them to put themselves and their chapels under the care of the British missionaries."

"Copy of a letter of instructions from the Missionary Committee in London, to the Rev. Messrs. R. Williams and the other British missionaries in the Provinces of Canada.

"DEAR BROTHER;—Herewith we transmit you a copy of resolutions, passed at our late conference, on the subject of the disputes which have un-

happily existed between our American brethren and us, relative to our missions in Canada.

"The preceding resolutions are general, and refer to the renewal of the intercourse, by personal deputation, between the American and British conferences, by the visit of Mr. Emory. We have given you the resolutions in full, that you may see that we have recognized the principle that the Methodist body is ONE throughout the world, and that therefore its members are bound to cordial affection and brotherly union.

"The resolutions of the committee, passed some time ago, and forwarded for your guidance, prohibiting any interference with the work of the American brethren, would show you that the existence of collisions between us and them gave us serious concern, and that the committee were anxious to remove, as far as they, at that time, were acquainted with the circumstances, every occasion of dispute.

"Certainly the case of Montreal chapel was one which we could never justify to our minds, and the committee *have in many instances had but a partial knowledge of the real religious wants of the Upper Province, and of its means of supply.* The only reason we could have for increasing the number of missionaries in that province was, the presumption of a *strong necessity, arising out of the destitute condition of the inhabitants, the total want, or too great distance of ministers.*

"On no other ground could we apply money raised for missionary purposes for the supply of preachers to Upper Canada. *The information we have had for two years past has all served to show that the number of preachers employed there by the American brethren was greater than we had at first supposed, and was constantly increasing.*

"To us, therefore, it now appears, that though there may be places in that province which are not visited, they are within the range, or constantly coming within the range, of the extended American itinerancy; and that Upper Canada does not present to our efforts a ground so fully and decidedly missionary as the Lower Province, where much less help exists, and a great part of the population is involved in Popish Superstition.

"We know that *political reasons exist in many minds* for supplying even Upper Canada, as far as possible, with British missionaries; and however natural this feeling may be to Englishmen, and even praiseworthy, when not carried too far, *it will be obvious to you that this is a ground on which, as a missionary society, and especially as a society under the direction of a committee which recognizes as brethren, and one with itself, the American Methodists, we cannot act.*

"1. Because, as a missionary society, *we cannot lay it down as a principle that those whose object is to convert the world shall be prevented from seeking and saving souls under a foreign government, for we do not thus regulate our own efforts.*

"2. *To act on this principle would be to cast an odium upon our American brethren, as though they did not conduct themselves peaceably under the British government, which is, we believe, contrary to the fact.*

"3. That if any particular exceptions to this Christian and submissive conduct were, on their part, to occur, we have not the least right to interfere, unless, indeed, the American conference obviously neglected to enforce upon the offending parties its own discipline. *Upon any political feeling which may exist, either in your minds or in the minds of a party in any place, we cannot therefore proceed.* Our objects are purely spiritual, and our American brethren and ourselves are one body of Christians, sprung from a common stock, holding the same doctrines, enforcing the same discipline, and striving in common to spread the light of true religion through the world.

"In conformity with these views, *we have long thought it a reproach, and doing more injury, by disturbing the harmony of the two connections, than could be counterbalanced by any local good, that the SAME CITY OR TOWN*

should see TWO CONGREGATIONS, and TWO SOCIETIES, and TWO PREACHERS, professing the same form of Christianity, and yet thus proclaiming themselves rivals to each other, and, in some instances, *invading each other's societies and chapels, and thus producing party feelings*. The purposes of each, we are ready to allow, have been good, though mistaken; and we rather blame ourselves for not having obtained more accurate information on some particulars, than intimate any dissatisfaction with the missionaries in the Canadas, with whose zeal and labors we have so much reason to be satisfied.

"A part of the evil has also arisen from the want of personal communication, by deputation, between the two conferences, now happily established. These considerations had long and seriously occupied our minds before the arrival of Mr. Emory, charged by the General American Conference to bring these matters under our consideration. The committee, previous to the conference, went with him fully into the discussion of the disputes in the Canadas, and recommended those principles of adjustment which the conference, after they had been referred to a special committee during the time of its sitting, adopted, and which we now transmit to all the brethren in the Canada station.

"You will consider these resolutions as the fruit of a very ample inquiry, and of serious deliberation.

"None of the principles here adopted by us do indeed go farther than to prevent interference with each other's labors among the American and British missionaries, and the *setting up of 'altar against altar,' in the same city, town or village*; but, knowing that circumstances of irritation exist, and that too near a proximity might, through the infirmity of human nature, lead to a violation of that union which the conference has deemed a matter of *paramount* importance to maintain, we have thought it best to adopt a geographical division of the labor of each, and that the *Upper Province should be left to the American brethren, and the Lower to you*. The reasons for this are,

"1. That the Upper Province is so adequately supplied by the American conference as not to present that pressing case of necessity which will justify our expending our funds upon it.

"2. That Mr. Emory has engaged that its full supply by American preachers shall be, as far as possible, attended to.

"3. That this measure at once terminates the dispute as to Montreal.

"4. That it will prevent collision without sacrifice of public good.

"5. That Lower Canada demands our efforts rather than Upper, as being more destitute, and the labors of the brethren there being more truly missionary.

"A transfer of societies and places of preaching will of course follow. Our societies in Upper Canada are to be put under the care of the American brethren; theirs in the Lower Province under yours.

"It is clear that this, under all circumstances, will require prudent and wise management, and we depend upon you to carry the arrangement into effect in the same spirit of kindness and temper in which the question has been determined by the conference and Mr. Emory.

"Feel that you are one with your American brethren, embarked in the same great cause, and eminently of the same religious family, and the little difficulties of arrangement will be easily surmounted; *and if any warm spirits (which is probable) rise up to trouble you, remember that you are to act upon the great principle sanctioned by the conference, and not upon local prejudices*. The same advice Mr. Emory has pledged himself shall be given to the American preachers, and you will each endeavor to transfer the same spirit into the societies respectively. When the preachers recognize each other as brethren, the people will naturally fall under the influence of the same feeling.

"We have appointed our respected brethren, Messrs. Williams and Hick, who are to choose as an associate a third preacher in full connection, to meet an equal number of preachers to be appointed by the American bishop, who

shall agree upon the time in which the chapels and societies shall be mutually transferred, and the arrangements of the conference be carried into effect. The place of the meeting they are to fix for their mutual convenience, but the meeting is to be held as early as possible after the receipt of the instructions of the committee, that the report of the final adjustment of the affair may appear in your next district minutes.

“ We conclude with our best wishes for your personal happiness and usefulness. May you ever go forth in the ‘fulness of the blessing of the gospel of peace,’ and be made the honored instruments of winning many souls to the knowledge and obedience of the faith of our Lord Jesus Christ.

“ We are, dear brother, yours very affectionately,

“ JOS. TAYLOR,
RICHARD WATSON,
Secretaries.

“ *Wesleyan Mission House, 77 Hatton }
Garden, 23d August, 1820.* ” }

THE SPECIAL CONFERENCE, AND ITS DECISIONS.

[COMMENCED IN TORONTO, OCT. 22nd, AND CLOSED OCT. 29th, 1840.]

From the Christian Guardian of Nov 4th.

In our last we gave a brief general view of the proceedings of the Special Conference of our Church down to Tuesday night; and we now add, that on Wednesday night, at half-past eleven, it terminated its sittings. Many subjects came under consideration on that day, and resolutions passed of great importance to the present position and prospects of the Wesleyan Methodist Church in Canada. The Rev. Thomas Whitehead (in the 87th year of his age and 53rd of his Ministry) was elected President for the present Conference year; and such alterations were made in the Stations as our present circumstances require. We have not space at present for the publication of more of the proceedings than what have immediate reference to the secession from our body of certain Preachers, the resolutions passed founded on the proceedings of the English Conference, and the Rev. Egerton Ryerson's speech in reply to a Pamphlet just published by the Rev. Messrs. Stinson and Richey. Mr. Ryerson's speech is published in compliance with the unanimous request of the Conference; and we have no doubt will be considered by the public an entire refutation of the unguarded and untrue statements made in that pamphlet. This we deem it. The Preachers who have now seceded and received certificates of character and standing at their own request, are, the Rev. Messrs. Case, E. Evans, J. Douse, B. Slight, M. Lang, (a member of the English Conference,) J. Norris, T. Fawcett, William Scott, J. Brock, J. G. Manly, C. B. Goodrich, and E. Stoney. We shall present the substance of what they said before the Conference on their resigning, just so far as it applies to their separation from our Church. Besides these brethren, the Rev. Messrs. W. Steer and J. Sunday sent a request for Certificates, and it was understood that two or three Preachers on trial wished to leave the Connexion. The separation of these brethren causes us regret; but, on the other hand, the interposition of the God of Methodism at this very time fills us with gladness; for we are able to say, in filling up the stations it was found that a number of young men, pious and intelligent, offered themselves for our work. So that the whole field is, at this moment, supplied with efficient labourers. This is encouraging, and, with other favourable circumstances, excites our gratitude to God, who will, as he has hitherto, bless us. In reporting what the different brethren said, we repeat, we present the substance, and shall stand corrected for any evident inaccuracies which may occur in our statements.

Mr. CASE said, I wish to communicate to my brethren my intentions as to my future progress, and to ask permission to resign my standing among them. I do not design to make a speech, having never been accustomed to long addresses: I never acquired the habit. My feelings are more than I can express: I do not retire from want of affection to my brethren. I see from the Resolutions we may be agitated again. My mind is deeply impressed; and I wish to be relieved from my present situation. I ask to be transferred from this Conference to the British Conference. It is well known what my views have long been. I do not wish my motives to be misconstrued. I have stood long enough to convince the brethren I am sincere. Let not my *motives* be impugned. It is my determination to continue in the work amongst the Indians; but I have two things to choose—one, to offer myself to the Methodist Church in the States, or join the Missionary Committee. My partialities are for the States; all my relations are there; but I have spent thirty years in the work in Canada. I feel fully prepared to say, that the people in Canada are among the best people in the world. If division takes place among them, they deserve a better fate. I do not design to make divisions in Societies. I doubt not if you give your whole heart to the work, it will prosper. I sincerely hope and pray the work will go on. I prefer the British Conference under the present circumstances. I cannot, as brother Jones said at the Hallowell Conference, agree with all they do. I admire their system; however, I do not approve of all their proceedings in this matter. God has blessed their labours in the conversion of the heathen, and I believe He has committed the conversion of the Indian Tribes in British North America into their hands: not that they shall make divisions. The Hudson Bay Indians are said to be a hundred thousand, all speaking Chipewa. We can render essential services in that region. These are my motives for engaging in the North American Mission. I respect the brethren of the Canada Conference. I therefore hope my brethren will give me a transfer to the British Conference.

[Mr. E. Ryerson observed, that if the views expressed by Mr. Case, that divisions ought not to be made in our Societies, and that the labours of the Wesleyan Missionary Committee in London should be directed to the conversion of the Aboriginal Indian Tribes; or as Mr. Case expressed himself to a Committee last evening, that he believed God had given the people in Canada to the Canada Preachers, but the heathen tribes to the British Conference; if these views had been acted upon by the Committee in London, no collisions or misunderstandings would have ensued; we should have readily acquiesced in those views; the present state of things would have been prevented; and the harmony of Methodism would have been maintained.]

Mr. EVANS announced his intention to leave the body. He felt indebted to the brethren; and he entertained a most cordial and brotherly feeling to most of the members of the Conference. To those with whom he differed in his views, he said he wished no ill. He wished to live in peace with all the brethren of the Conference. He did not wish his motives to be impugned. So far he said he had been honoured by his brethren. It was not from pecuniary motives or considerations he left the Conference. He had seen pledges broken by Mr. Ryerson: he expected no better attention to be given to them in future. With expressions of regard and affection, he begged to

resign his standing as Chairman of the London District and his connexion with this body, and desired a certificate of his character.

Mr. DOUSE said his relation to the Canada Conference was of a peculiar kind. He was a missionary sent out to this country by the Missionary Committee. He had long been dissatisfied with the proceedings of the Canada Conference, and referred to the resolutions passed in 1837, when he affirmed the first fatal blow was struck at the Union. Had the Union continued, unless a different course had been pursued, he would have left the Connexion. He asked a recommendation to the British Conference. For most of the brethren of the Canada Conference he entertained a hearty esteem; and added, had not the organ of the Conference done as it had, he should have continued.

Mr. SLIGHT said brother Douse's position was similar to his own; and referred to his christian experience and call to the ministry. He entertained a cordial good will to most of the members of this Conference. His wish was to retire and have a transfer.

Mr. LANG informed the brethren he should have spoken first, but as a member of the British Conference he did not think it necessary. He resigned as Chairman of the Bay of Quinte District, expressing his esteem for the brethren; adding he had done his best to serve the Canada Conference while he had been connected with it.

Mr. NORRIS felt under the painful necessity of asking a transfer. It was about fourteen years since his first connection with this Conference. He deplored his unfaithfulness; still he had done his best to serve the body. Whatever might be thought of his motives, he entertained a warm affection for this Conference. He said he had not determined on his future course, except to offer himself to the British Conference. He asked a recommendation to the British Conference in case they would accept him. He hoped the Lord would direct him and make him useful.

Mr. FAWCETT wished to make a similar request to be transferred to the British Conference. He stated the circumstances under which he came from England to this country, and of his being taken into the ministry by the Canada Conference. He had an affection for all the brethren of this Conference; he loved them all.

Mr. W. SCOTT did not think it necessary to say much. There were members of this Conference for whom he had contracted the warmest affection. He spoke of his conversion in England, and of his coming to the States, and then to Canada. His preference was for Canada, though certain circumstances had detained him some time at New-York. He said it would be remembered he came to Upper Canada that he might have a closer connexion with the British Conference. He, after some other remarks, expressive of his regret at the present position of affairs, begged leave to tender his resignation.

Mr. BROCK said his feelings were such as he never expected to have. He rose to request a certificate of character; remarking brethren had gone from this Conference on different accounts. He wished to go away because he did not wish to contend. He came a stranger to this Province, and had laboured with this Conference; and now was doomed to be separated from the brethren with whom he thought he should have lived and died. He said,

I want not to contend with the British Conference ; and were I disposed, I should be blamed by my brethren. I cannot do it: Mr. Brock was much affected and paused, when—

[Mr. E. Ryerson emphatically said, We have no intention to carry hostility into the British Conference nor to interfere with their work in any way. The ground in Upper Canada was ours, and if they interfered, they, not we, would be responsible for the contention which would ensue.]

Mr. Brock went on to say, he could not contend, he could not oppose the British Conference nor the Canada Conference. He could leave the country. He owed his conversion not to the English Methodists, nor to the Canadian Methodists, but to Mr. Wesley's works. If contention would cease, he would return to this Conference to labour with them. If the line between our labours and the labours of the Missionaries could be drawn, he would not go. He greatly respected his brethren of the Canada Conference. He asked a transfer to the British Conference.

MR. MANLY cherished no feeling to any member of the Canada Conference but brotherly love. He did not wish to be arrayed against the British Conference, nor against this Conference. He should retire from the province ; and asked a certificate of character.

[The President said he had kind feelings for the brethren who had gone from us. He touched on the circumstances attending the separation ; and added, *can* this Conference adopt any *other* course of proceeding in regard of the conduct of the British Conference ?]

Mr. Manly continued : He hoped nothing would be said to impugn his motives : he disclaimed all that might be alleged against them, and wished to retire.

[Mr. E. Ryerson expressed the opinion that the members of this Conference had as much reason to request those who went out from us not to impugn our motives as they had successively to request us not to impugn their motives.]

[Mr. Wilson observed, I have been a member of the Methodist Church for 41 years. I have seen a variety of difficulties in this province. Many parties have risen up, and had their day. All this time I have kept close to this Conference, though not without my sorrows and afflictions. I intend still to do so. We are losing fourteen men. Though in the seventy-first year of my age I am willing to labour with my brethren in any capacity.— My infirmities have made it necessary for me to stand in a superannuated relation ; but if I am wanted, I will go anywhere : I am at the service of my brethren. I am 36 years a preacher ; and I am not tired yet. God is with us. I offer myself ; I mean to live and die with these my brethren.]

MR. C. B. GOODERICH expressed a wish to have a certificate of his standing as he was going to the States. What had been done in withholding his ordination was one reason for his determining thus. At the Hamilton Conference his mind was wounded. He forgave the brethren, but he conceived he had been unjustly treated. Still he bore them no ill will : on the other hand, he respected them and wished them well. He begged to be permitted to retire from the Conference, not to unite with any body in this country, but to go into the States. For this reason he hoped his brethren would grant him a certificate of character.

Mr. STONEY spoke a few words, but from the distance he was from us and the lowness of his voice, we could not catch his meaning. We were informed he asked a certificate of character, and told the Conference, should any change take place in his views, he should say so to his brethren.

We listened with an indelible emotion to the expressions of attachment to the fathers and brethren of the Conference by those who went out from among us. We wept that human frailty should stand in the way of unity, and while we conscientiously differed from those taking, to us, an unwise departure, we regarded them with a sincere affection. We cannot, however, let this opportunity pass without saying, we were much surprised at the utter forgetfulness on the part of every speaker, of the main considerations inseparable from the exciting occasion—the great and fundamental principles of the Methodist family throughout the world; which are those of the Canada Conference. Those principles are known, and tried, and unchangeable.—At such a time they demanded recognition and a scrupulous and solemn observance. The Wesleyan Methodist Church in Canada is one in doctrine, discipline, and spirit with those of the other sections of Methodism in every part of the world. There is an unbroken *oneness*—a oneness, let us say, forbidding the steps taken by the respected brethren in their present separation: a oneness the Canada Conference will determinedly maintain. Our prayers and our affections go with those who go; and may wisdom and grace from on high guide their feet in a prudent and pious way. While of those who stay, the choice of our judgment and our love, we say, this people shall be our people, and their God our God! preferring this prayer at the throne of grace for them—May “they who go forth weeping bearing precious seed, come again rejoicing bringing their sheaves with them!”

RESOLUTIONS OF THE CONFERENCE FOUNDED ON THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE ENGLISH CONFERENCE.

Question I.—WHAT IS THE JUDGMENT OF THE CONFERENCE RELATIVE TO THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE WESLEYAN CONFERENCE IN ENGLAND ON THE SUBJECT OF THE UNION?

Answer I.—That it is a matter of deep regret that the authorities of the Conference in England did not think proper to receive and treat the Representatives of this Conference in the manner that Representatives of Methodist Conferences have been invariably treated by the authorities in Methodist Conferences in every part of the Methodistic world, and in the manner in which the Representative of this Conference has been heretofore treated at the Wesleyan Conferences in England, and in the manner in which the Representatives of the English Conference have been treated by this Conference.

2.—That it is deeply to be regretted that the consideration of the Canadian business, by the English Conference, so essentially affecting the interests of

Methodism and Religion in this country, was deferred until after three-fourths of the members of the Conference had departed for their Circuits.

3.—That, as was shown by the Representatives of this Conference, in a letter addressed to the Secretary of the English Conference, and as has not been denied by Messrs. Stinson and Richey, in an attempted answer to our Representatives, the enumeration of documents and statements which were laid before the Committee of the Wesleyan Conference assembled at Newcastle-upon-Tyne, appears to be very defective and partial, and calculated to convey a most erroneous impression in regard to the proceedings and character of this Conference.

4.—That the allegations contained in the Resolutions of the Committee in London, dated April 20, 1840, and which were regarded by the authorities of the English Conference as “fully proved,” are expressly contradicted by His Excellency the Governor General of Canada, whose testimony is the highest evidence which the nature of the case would admit; and the decision of the authorities of the English Conference involves assumptions of power, by confirming the aforesaid resolutions of the London Committee, which are inconsistent with the letter and spirit of the articles of the Union between the English and Canadian Conferences.

5.—That the demand by the authorities of the Conference in England, “That the *continuation* of the Government grant to the Wesleyan Missionary Society be cordially assented to, and supported by our Upper Canadian brethren, *even if its payment should be ultimately transferred to the Clergy Reserve Fund in that Province;*” and their requiring the Rev. Egerton Ryerson to write a letter to Lord John Russell, “requesting that its regular payment may be continued,” is unfounded in any obligations arising out of the Union; as it was never understood or intended that this Conference or any of its members should advocate either the restoration or continuance of any grant or grants made by Government to the Wesleyan Missionary Society.

6.—That the desire and determination of this Conference that “the Christian Guardian shall entirely abstain from all party political reasonings and discussions,” appear not only to have been fully expressed by our Representatives, but also to have been admitted by the English Conference as satisfactory, as they state—“We are most happy to perceive that one of these resolutions which determines that the Christian Guardian shall cease to be a political paper, and shall be confined to purely religious and literary subjects and articles of religious intelligence, is to that extent satisfactory.”

7.—That the requirement by the authorities of the Wesleyan Conference in England, that the official organ of this Conference should “admit and maintain” the duty of civil governments to employ resources at their disposal to support religion, as an acknowledged principle of Wesleyan Methodism, is incompatible with the original articles of the Union, as declared by

the Representatives of the English Conference at the time the Union was consummated and as illustrated by their co-operation with this Conference from 1833 to 1839. Whatever opinions may be entertained of the principle of Church Establishments in the abstract, the advocacy of the application of it to this country by the official organ of this Conference is, at least, inexpedient—involving as it does a wide field of political discussion, and calculated to produce much contention and division amongst the people—and especially as Mr. Wesley himself and his Conference regarded a National Church as having no ground in the New Testament, but as being “a merely political institution.”

8.—That the assumption by the Wesleyan Conference in England of the right and power of an “official influence” and “efficient direction” over the “public proceedings” of this Conference, is repugnant to the express provisions of the Articles of Union, which declared that the “rights and privileges of the Canadian Preachers and Societies should be preserved inviolate,” and is inconsistent with the obligations and responsibilities of this Conference to the Societies and work providentially committed to its pastoral oversight.

9.—That the avowed dissolution of the Union by the English Conference on the ground of the non-compliance of our Representatives with requirements and assumptions not authorised by the Articles of the Union, is a plain and lamentable violation of solemnly ratified obligations to this Conference and to the Wesleyan Methodist Church in Canada.

10.—That this Conference protests against the Methodistic or legal right or power of the Conference in England to dissolve, of its own accord, articles and obligations which have been entered into with this Conference by mutual consent.

11.—That in the foregoing expressions of our views and feelings relative to the proceedings of the authorities of the Wesleyan Conference in England, we disclaim any imputation upon their character or motives. It is their acts only of which we complain. We rejoice to know that the great majority of the members have taken no part in these proceedings of the authorities of the English Conference; and we deem it alike our duty and our privilege to esteem them as fathers and brethren in the Ministry of the Word and in the Church of our Lord Jesus Christ.

Question II.—WHAT IS THE JUDGMENT OF THIS CONFERENCE ON THE ESTABLISHMENT BY THE WESLEYAN MISSIONARY COMMITTEE IN LONDON OF SEPARATE CONGREGATIONS AND SOCIETIES WITHIN THE BOUNDARIES OF THE WESLEYAN METHODIST CHURCH IN UPPER CANADA?

Answer 1.—The adoption of such a course of proceeding is subversive of the great and sacred principles of Methodistic unity, as laid down by the Venerable Wesley himself, and as has heretofore been formally and officially and practically recognized by the Wesleyan Conferences in England and in

the United States. The following extracts from the Minutes of the English Wesleyan Conference, held in Liverpool, August, 1820, and signed "JABEZ BUNTING, *President*," and "GEORGE MARSDEN, *Secretary*," contain an explicit statement of these principles:—

"On the subject of the unpleasant circumstances which have occurred in the Canadas between the American preachers and our missionaries, referred to the conference by the missionary committee in London, with their opinion that Upper Canada shall be left in possession of the American brethren, and that our missionary exertions shall be confined to the Lower Province, this committee recommend to the conference the adoption of the following principles and arrangements:—

"1. That, as the American Methodists and ourselves are but one body, *it would be inconsistent with our unity, and dangerous to that affection which ought to characterize us in every place, to have different societies and congregations in the same towns and villages, or to allow of any intrusion on either side into each other's labours.*

"2. *That this principle shall be the rule by which the disputes now existing in the Canadas, between our missionaries, shall be terminated.*

"3. That the simplest and most effectual manner of carrying this rule into effect appears to us to be, to accede to the suggestion of the American conference, that the American brethren shall have the occupation of Upper Canada, and the British missionaries that of Lower Canada, allowing sufficient time for carrying this arrangement into effect, with all possible tenderness to existing prejudices and conflicting interests on both sides; the arrangement to be completed within a period to be fixed as early as possible by the missionary committee. But should insuperable difficulties occur in the attempt to execute this plan, (which, however, we do not anticipate,) either party shall be at liberty to propose any other mode of accommodation which shall assume as *its basis the great principle laid down in the first of these resolutions, and which we are of opinion should be held most sacred in every part of the world.*

"4. That if hereafter it shall appear to any of our brethren there, either British missionaries or American preachers, that any place on either side the boundary line, now mentioned, needs religious help, and presents a favorable opportunity for usefulness, the case shall be referred by the Canada district meeting to the General Conference, or by that body to the Canada district; and if either shall formally decline to supply the place on their own side the boundary, then the other shall be at liberty to supply the said place, without being deemed to have violated the terms of this friendly compact.

"5. And it shall be explicitly understood in this arrangement, that each party shall be bound to supply with preachers all those stations and their dependencies which shall be relinquished by each of the connexions, that no place on either side shall sustain any loss of the ordinances of religion in consequence of this arrangement.

"6. That the missionary committee be directed to address a letter to the private and official members, trustees, &c., under the care of our missionaries in Upper Canada, informing them of the judgment of the conference, and affectionately and earnestly advising them to put themselves and their chapels under the pastoral care of the American preachers, with the suggestion of such considerations, to incline them to it, as the committee may judge most proper.

"7. That the bishops of the American connexion shall direct a similar letter to the private and official members, trustees, &c., under the care of the American preachers in the province of Lower Canada, requesting them to put themselves and their chapels under the care of the British missionaries."

The following extracts of a letter of instructions from the Missionary Committee in London to their missionaries in the Canadas, signed, "JOSEPH TAYLOR, RICHARD WATSON, Secretaries," and dated, "*Wesleyan Mission House, 77, Hatton Garden, London, 23rd August, 1820,*" furnish a clear exposition of the application of the above avowed principles to the case of Upper Canada :

"Extracts of a Letter of Instructions from the Missionary Committee in London, to the Rev. Messrs. R. Williams and the other British missionaries in the Provinces of Canada.

"DEAR BROTHER;—Herewith we transmit you a copy of resolutions, passed at our late conference, on the subject of the disputes which have unhappily existed between our American brethren and us, relative to our missions in Canada."

"We have given you the resolutions in full, that you may see that we have recognized the principle that the Methodist body is ONE throughout the world, and that therefore its members are bound to cordial affection and brotherly union.

"The resolutions of the committee, passed some time ago, and forwarded for your guidance, prohibiting any interference with the work of the American brethren, would show you that the existence of collisions between us and them gave us serious concern, and that the committee were anxious to remove, as far as they, at that time, were acquainted with the circumstances, every occasion of dispute.

"Certainly the case of Montreal chapel was one which we could never justify to our minds, and the committee have in many instances had but a partial knowledge of the real religious wants of the Upper Province, and of its means of supply. The only reason we could have for increasing the number of missionaries in that province was, the presumption of a strong necessity, arising out of the destitute condition of the inhabitants, the total want, or too great distance of ministers.

"On no other ground could we apply money raised for missionary purposes for the supply of preachers to Upper Canada. The information we have had for two years past has all served to show that the number of preachers employed there by the American brethren was greater than we had at first supposed, and was constantly increasing.

"To us, therefore, it now appears, that though there may be places in that province which are not visited, they are within the range, or constantly coming within the range, of the extended American itinerancy; and that Upper Canada does not present to our efforts a ground so fully and decidedly missionary as the Lower Province, where much less help exists, and a great part of the population is involved in Popish Superstition.

"We know that political reasons exist in many minds for supplying even Upper Canada, as far as possible, with British missionaries; and however natural this feeling may be to Englishmen, and even praiseworthy, when not carried too far, it will be obvious to you that this is a ground on which, as a missionary society, and especially as a society under the direction of a committee which recognizes as brethren, and one with itself, the American Methodists, we cannot act.

"1. Because, as a missionary society, we cannot lay it down as a principle that those whose object is to convert the world shall be prevented from seeking and saving souls under a foreign government, for we do not thus regulate our own efforts.

"2. To act on this principle would be to cast an odium upon our American brethren, as though they did not conduct themselves peaceably under the British government, which is, we believe, contrary to the fact.

" 3. That if any particular exceptions to this Christian and submissive conduct were, on their part, to occur, we have not the least right to interfere, unless, indeed, the American conference obviously neglected to enforce upon the offending parties its own discipline. *Upon any political feeling which may exist, either in your minds or in the minds of a party in any place, we cannot therefore proceed.* Our objects are *purely spiritual, and our American brethren and ourselves are one body of Christians*, sprung from a common stock, holding the same doctrines, enforcing the same discipline, and striving in common to spread the light of true religion through the world.

" In conformity with these views, *we have long thought it a reproach, and doing more injury, by disturbing the harmony of the two connexions, than could be counterbalanced by any local good*, that the SAME CITY OR TOWN should see TWO CONGREGATIONS, and TWO SOCIETIES, and TWO PREACHERS, professing the same form of Christianity, and yet thus proclaiming themselves rivals to each other, and, in some instances, *invading each other's societies and chapels, and thus producing party feelings.*"

" The committee, previous to the conference, went with him fully into the discussion of the disputes in the Canadas, and recommended those principles of adjustment which the conference, after they had been referred to a special committee during the time of its sitting, adopted, and which we now transmit to all the brethren in the Canada station.

" *You will consider these resolutions as the fruit of a very ample inquiry, and of serious deliberation.*

" None of the principles here adopted by us do indeed go farther than to prevent interference with each other's labours among the American and British missionaries, and *the setting up of 'altar against altar,' in the same city, town or village*; but, knowing that circumstances of irritation exist, and that too near a proximity might, through the infirmity of human nature, lead to a violation of that union which the conference has deemed a matter of *paramount* importance to maintain, we have thought it best to adopt a geographical division of the labour of each, and that the *Upper Province should be left to the American brethren, and the Lower to you.*"

" Feel that you are one with your American brethren, embarked in the same great cause, and eminently of the same religious family, and the little difficulties of arrangement will be easily surmounted; *and if any warm spirits (which is probable) rise up to trouble you, remember that you are to act upon the great principle sanctioned by the conference, and not upon local prejudices.*"

2.—That the application of the Scriptural and Methodistic principles stated in the foregoing resolution, is, if possible, of more sacred and paramount obligation in regard to Upper Canada now than it was in 1820—as the Ministers of our Church in this Province were then sent by the Methodist Conference in the United States, and were under a foreign ecclesiastical jurisdiction; but they are now all bona fide British subjects, and our Conference is as much a British Wesleyan Conference as the Conference held in England.

3.—That upon these Wesleyan and Scriptural principles we take our stand as a body of Ministers and as a regular branch of the great Wesleyan Family, and protest against its violation on the part of the Wesleyan Missionary Committee in London, and deprecate the ruin to souls, the injury to Methodism and to Religion, which must result from setting up altar against altar, dividing families, societies and neighbourhoods, and creating contentions, schisms, and divisions in the Church of Christ.

4.—That, as it appears that the Wesleyan Conference in England has not rescinded the resolutions which it adopted in 1820, and could not therefore have intended that the Committee in London should contravene and violate them in establishing rival preachers and congregations in Upper Canada, when the carrying out the dissolution of the Union was referred by the Conference to the Committee, we will not hold the Conference in England, as a Body, blameable for such a course of proceeding, unless, on its being submitted to them, it shall receive their sanction—which we will not persuade ourselves can be the case.

5.—That on the return to and recognition of these hallowed and inviolable principles of Christian and Wesleyan unity on the part of the Committee in London, we will rejoice to avail ourselves of the first opportunity thus afforded, to bury in oblivion all the differences and unhappy feelings of the past, and to cultivate those sentiments and feelings of fraternal respect and affection which have heretofore so happily and honorably characterized the relations and intercourse of all branches of the Wesleyan Family.

Question III.—WHAT IS THE JUDGMENT OF THIS CONFERENCE IN REGARD TO OUR PRESENT POSITION AND DUTY AS A BODY OF MINISTERS AND AS A CHURCH ?

Answer 1.—That we adhere to our Doctrines and Discipline which have been recognized even by the Conference in England as truly Wesleyan, and which have been signally owned of God in promoting the interests of true Religion in this Province.

2.—That we permit no discussions of political questions amongst us in Conference as a Church; that our official organ enter into no political discussions, but that it continue to pursue its present neutral course in matters of civil polity—our Editor occupying its columns with religious and literary subjects, with articles of religious and general intelligence, and with such defences of our institutions and character as occasion may require.

3.—That we do most solemnly and heartily recognize the original purpose of Methodism, “to spread Scriptural holiness over the land,” as the first and great calling of the whole body, and especially of the Preachers; and determine, in the strength of God, to make this the great rule of all our other designs, and to renounce or subordinate all other plans and pursuits to this our special calling; so that by our living, as well as by our preaching, we may hold forth the word of life, and rejoice, in the day of Christ, that we have not run in vain, neither laboured in vain.

4.—That under a deep persuasion that the unity, order, purity, edification and good feeling of our Societies may be greatly promoted by our pastoral intercourse with them, we resolve to give ourselves more fully to this branch of our work; and more especially that we will care for the sick, the afflicted, and the distressed, and will endeavour to obtain the help of our brethren in

order to secure to our people of every class and condition that Christian oversight of their spiritual interests which is so beneficial, and so essential to their spiritual comfort and prosperity.

5.—That we determine, by God's gracious assistance, to be more fervent and importunate in supplicating upon ourselves, and upon all our official members, societies and congregations, that rich effusion of the Holy Spirit which is always necessary to the success of the labours of Christian Ministers and Pastors, and which is peculiarly needed, at the present time, to prepare both ourselves and our people for the trials, duties, and labours of the present year.

6.—That, being fellow-residents in the country with our congregations, and identified with them in our interests, feelings, and Christian principles, we entreat them to unite with us in this renewed dedication of ourselves and our all as a people to the great work of promoting glory to God in the highest, peace on earth, and good will amongst men.

THE REV. EGERTON RYERSON'S SPEECH BEFORE THE CONFERENCE IN REPLY TO THE REV. MESSRS. STINSON AND RICHEY'S PAMPHLET.

(PUBLISHED BY THE UNANIMOUS REQUEST OF THE CONFERENCE.)

MR. PRESIDENT;—I rise to vindicate the Report of our late Mission to England, and the character of this Conference, against a PAMPHLET published yesterday by the Rev. Messrs. STINSON and RICHEY, entitled "*A Plain Statement of Facts connected with the Union and Separation of the British and Canadian Conferences*"—a Pamphlet which I hastily read last evening—on which I have not had time to make a single note, but which, I am, nevertheless, from general recollection of facts and authorities, prepared to show, is fraught with MIS-"statements of Facts," from the beginning to the end.

This Pamphlet purports to be a reply to the Report of our Mission to England by my brother, (Rev. Wm. Ryerson) and myself, and to our Pamphlet published in London, containing 120 pages, exclusive of our Report, which occupies 20 pages; but it is a singular, as well as gratifying circumstance, that after the most vigorous efforts on the part of Messrs. STINSON and RICHEY, they have succeeded in detecting but one erroneous statement in our entire publications—and that an incorrect statement of financial details, and not in the slightest degree, affecting the general merits of the case.

Mr. Alder had stated in a Letter to Lord JOHN RUSSELL, that when the Wesleyan Committee assumed the responsibility of supporting the Canada Missions (Oct. 1833) the various sums raised by the Upper Canada Conference amounted to the small sum of £177 18s. 1d., sterling. We showed from the Canada Missionary Report for the year ending October 1833, that the various sums raised by the Conference during that year amounted to £1322 currency. But though this is the sum total stated in the Report, there are two items on the debtor's side of the Treasurer's Report which ought to have been deducted. The one was the sum of £286 5s. 4d. advanced by Mr. J. R. Armstrong, Treasurer; the other, £129 7s. 5½d., being a balance in the Treasurer's hands from the surplus receipts of the preceding year. In these items we stand corrected by Messrs. Stinson and Richey.

My brother has stated to you how the error occurred, as he prepared the

financial part of our statement—that I had neither time nor strength to examine its accuracy—that it never occurred to him to deduct any of the items given under the head of *Receipts*. But it is clear, that the amount we stated was available to the Canada Conference for its Missionary operations during the year ending Oct. 1833, though not all raised that year.

It also appears from a careful scrutiny that there were £96 more collected in the United States that year than was credited by us to our American brethren. The entire amount, however, was raised by the exertions of this Conference.

Now these are all the errors which Messrs. Stinson and Richey have been able to detect in our Report and Pamphlet—although the latter contains a series of financial statements, embracing a great variety of items and calculations!

They have, indeed, imputed these errors to the worst of motives; but what are the facts of the case? I hold in my hand a financial table—in my brother's hand writing—prepared by him with a good deal of labour, embracing the receipts, from various quarters, of Missionary monies from 1832 to 1839—and various appropriations, &c. This table was prepared, not for publication, but to aid me in replying to Mr. Alder's letter to Lord John Russell, which was read as part of his speech to the committee of the English Conference. I was not, however, allowed to reply to Mr. Alder's letter before the committee of the English Conference. I then invited an investigation of Mr. Alder's financial statement by any three members of that committee, who were experienced accountants, and offered to prove to them, from printed reports, that Mr. Alder had mis-stated facts to the amount of hundreds of pounds. They, however, declined the investigation which I desired. It is obvious, that when such were the circumstances under which my brother prepared our financial statement, and such the objects of it, it must have been prepared with a view to accuracy. And when our letter to Lord John Russell, containing the statement, was transmitted to his Lordship, we also enclosed, for his Lordship's examination, all the Reports referred to in our letter; which was intended for Lord John Russell alone, and with no view to publication, as insinuated by Messrs. Stinson and Richey. The publication of that letter in England, as well as the whole of the proceedings of the English and Canada Conferences, was suggested by circumstances which transpired several days after it was written and delivered to the Secretary of State for the Colonies.

But what object do Messrs. Stinson and Richey gain by this mode of argumentation in behalf of Mr. Alder, whom they propose to vindicate? Mr. Alder had stated that when the Wesleyan Committee in London assumed the responsibility of supporting the Indian Missions in Upper Canada, this Conference raised the small sum of £177; Messrs. Stinson and Richey say it "was only £907 6s. 7 $\frac{1}{2}$ d."—thus convicting Mr. Alder of misstating the facts of the case to the disadvantage of this Conference to the amount of nearly *seven hundred pounds!* Such is their own vindication of Mr. Alder on this point!

Messrs. Stinson and Richey have employed considerable labour to ascertain and exhibit the receipts of our Missionary Society from 1829 to 1832—thus diverting attention from the real question at issue, which was the amount raised by this Conference for Missionary purposes at the time the union took place.—If it were true that the receipts of our Missionary Society during those years were so small in comparison of what they were in 1832 and 1833, it only proves that our missionary collections and subscriptions were increasing at the rate of from *fifty to one hundred* per cent a year, up to the time of the Union, when they fell off more than five hundred per cent, and have only gradually been raised to their original amount. Messrs. Stinson and Richey ought also to have added that during those years several Tribes of Indians were converted from Heathenism to Christianity, and that we had a net increase in the mem-

bership of our Church during that very period of more than 4000 souls, and raised nearly all our subscriptions for the erection of the buildings of the Upper Canada Academy; and that in 1832 we had twenty-five per cent more Indians in Church Communion, and forty per cent more Indian children in our Mission Schools than we have at the present time. These are very serious omissions on the part of Messrs. Stinson and Richey; and the truth is as often misstated by omitting essential facts, as by inventing imaginary ones.

But one object of Messrs. Stinson and Richey in their proposed exhibit of the receipts of our Missionary Society from 1829 to 1832, appears to be, to show that large sums had been obtained from the United States; and they have sedulously collected together items of that description. Suppose all these statements were true, are they disreputable to any of the parties concerned? When the first Indian Missions were established in this Province, we had an ecclesiastical connexion with the United States Methodist Conference, and our Missionary Society was auxiliary to the Missionary Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church in the United States. When we, by mutual consent, became an independent Church, and our missionary operations independent, our American Brethren still continued to feel a deep interest in the cause of Indian Missions in this Province, and forwarded liberal contributions towards their support, without asking any control over them, or any other return than a few copies of our Missionary Reports; whilst we, on the other hand, aided them in some of their North Western Indian Missions with Indian Interpreters and Speakers.

There is, however, another view to be taken of this part of Messrs. Stinson and Richey's pamphlet. Mr. Alder stated to Lord John Russell that there were more "*political* than religious sympathizers in the United States," and that our efforts to obtain assistance from that quarter were "found to be ineffectual." According to Messrs. Stinson and Richey *large* assistance was obtained from the United States. If their statements are correct, Mr. Alder's letter to Lord John Russell is untrue. Mr. Alder may well say, "Save me from my friends!"

Another view still. According to Messrs. Stinson and Richey, frequent and large donations were made by the Methodist Missionary Committee in New-York, in aid of Canadian Missions—a liberality which we gratefully appreciate and rejoice to acknowledge; in connexion with which was a permission for our Missionary Agents to hold meetings and make collections in various Methodist chapels in the United States. But, according to Messrs. Stinson and Richey's own showing, the Wesleyan Missionary Committee in London made but *one* donation—a donation of £300 sterling. And according to the correspondence which took place between our Missionary Board and the Missionary Secretaries in London in 1832, that solitary donation was made in connexion with one declaration and two conditions. The declaration was, that if we ever again sent agents to apply for assistance in England, the Wesleyan Missionary Committee in London would discountenance them. The conditions were, 1. That the Rev. Peter Jones should not apply to any of the friends of the Wesleyan Missionary Society in England in aid of Canadian Missions. 2. That Mr. Jones should attend as many Missionary Meetings in England as the Committee might request him to attend. The contrast between the proceedings of the London and New-York Missionary Committees in these respects is very striking and significant.

I have thus disposed of the only part of Messrs. Stinson and Richey's pamphlet in which there is even a shadow of *plausibility* in the estimation of any candid man who is conversant with all the facts of the questions at issue. I will now proceed to show that this pamphlet is the most disgraceful tissue of misstatements that was ever palmed upon the Canadian public.

I shall refer, first, to Messrs. Stinson and Richey's laboured misrepresentation of the main questions at issue between Mr. Alder and ourselves. They

represent them as one of ability or inability of this Conference to supply the Religious wants of this Province, when every man who has attentively read the letter of Mr. Alder and our letter to Lord John Russell, knows that that question was not even mooted on either side. And upon this flagrant misrepresentation of the questions at issue, they quote the evidence which I gave before the Court at Kingston in 1837 on the Belleville Chapel case. This attempt to murder my reputation, I leave to be characterised by others as it deserves; and will content myself with the exposure of its injustice and iniquity. I will here quote my evidence with Messrs. Stinson and Richey's own *italics and capitals* :

"In 1832, the Wesleyan Missionary Committee in London, sent out the Rev. Mr. Alder, as their representative agent, with a view to the appointment of Missionaries among the British emigrants in various parts of this Province. Mr. Alder had communications from the Committee in London to our Missionary Board in Toronto, which he delivered—communicating to the Board, at the same time, the objects of his Mission. OUR BOARD ADMITTED OUR INABILITY TO SUPPLY THE RELIGIOUS WANTS OF THE COUNTRY, but stated at length to Mr. Alder, and in writing to the Committee in London, the evils likely to arise from the existence of two bodies of Methodists in this Province—its infringement of the hitherto universally-acknowledged principle, that the Wesleyan Methodists were one body throughout the world—and the desirableness of uniting the means and energies of the two Connexions to promote the religious improvement of the ABORIGINAL TRIBES AND NEW SETTLEMENTS of the Country."

Such is what Messrs. Stinson and Richey call my "*sworn testimony*," and which they adduce in refutation of our letter to Lord John Russell in reply to Mr. Alder. Now, justice, as well as charity, demands that if the statements of any two historians or witnesses, much more the statements of the same person made at different times, can be reconciled, they ought not to be placed in opposition to each other. In my evidence I stated that Mr. Alder came here "with a view to the appointment of Missionaries among the *British Emigrants* in various parts of the Province." I then state, not in reference to the Indian Missions already established, nor even in reference to the Indian Tribes, but in reference to those amongst whom Mr. Alder proposed to appoint Missionaries, that "our Board admitted its inability to supply the religious wants of the country." I then speak of the evil of establishing distinct societies and operations, and state the feeling cherished by our Board in regard to the "*desirableness* of uniting the means and energies of the two Connexions to promote the religious improvement of the aboriginal Indian tribes and new settlements of the country." I will here adduce two of the Resolutions adopted by our Missionary Board in 1832, (enclosed by us to Lord John Russell,) as illustrating, not the inconsistency of my *oath* with my other statements, but as illustrating the remarkable agreement of the one with the other, both in sentiment and in fact, though they were prepared on different occasions and four years' distance of time from each other. The Resolutions are as follows:—

"7. That the establishment of two distinct connexions of Methodists in this Province, would, in the opinion of the Board, be productive of unpleasant feelings, litigation, and party disputes, to the discredit of Methodism and the great injury of religion; but that the energies of the English and Canada connexions, if combined, would, under the blessing of God, close the door against all collision and party feeling, and contribute greatly to the extension of the work, both amongst the white population and the Indian tribes.

"8. That in order to prevent misunderstandings—to preserve peace and harmony in the Societies—to supply every part of the work throughout the Province—and to enlarge the field of Missionary operations among the aboriginal inhabitants, the Board respectfully suggests to our Conference at its approaching session, the propriety and importance of proposing such a coalition with the English Conference as will accomplish these objects."

Such is the endeavour of Messrs. Stinson and Richey to convict me of

perjury! I envy not, I pity from my heart, the feelings which could dictate such an effort; while I smile at its utter impotence. But all this time, whilst Messrs. Stinson and Richey were aiming a deadly blow at my moral character, they were misrepresenting the main questions at issue between Mr. Alder and the Representatives of this Conference. Those questions were not, whether this Conference was able or unable to supply the religious wants of Upper Canada. It is asserted by the highest authorities in England, that both the Established Church and the Wesleyan Methodists are utterly unable to supply the religious wants of Great Britain—that there are hundreds of thousands there in a state of religious destitution and moral abandonment. But Mr. Alder had asserted—1. That this Conference entered into the Union with the English Conference in order “*to save our Indian Missions from ruin.*” 2. That at the time of the formation of the Union our Missionary Buildings were in such “*a dilapidated state*” that “*very large sums* were of necessity expended in placing them in anything like a state of efficiency.” Neither of these statements had any connexion with supplying the religious wants of the country generally. We denied and refuted both of these statements. We did so by adducing the Correspondence of our Missionary Board with the Wesleyan Committee in London relative to the formation of the Union, and by appealing to the Missionary Reports for the years referred to. We showed that only £41 had been expended by the Wesleyan Missionary Committee in London in repairing “*dilapidated buildings*” throughout all our Indian Missions during the first year after our Union. This Messrs. Stinson and Richey have not ventured to deny. We showed that our Missionary Board maintained, in 1832, the ability of this Connexion to support its Missions. On this point also Messrs. Stinson and Richey are as silent as the grave. In order to escape from their dilemma, they run away from the points in debate, and talk lustily about the inability of the Canada Conference to supply the religious wants of the country! A cause which needs such manœuvring and misrepresentation to support it, cannot be the cause of justice, of truth, or of Methodism.

In the 7th and 11th pages of their Pamphlet Messrs. Stinson and Richey deny that it was the object of the Missionary Secretaries in London, in the formation of the Union, to secure the “*absolute supremacy of the Committee and Conference in England over all the Departments and Institutions of the Wesleyan Methodist Church in Canada.*” They affirm “*that neither was any declaration uttered by Dr. Alder during the discussion, (lately in England,) nor any of the Resolutions referred to, fairly susceptible of such an interpretation.*” They also charge us with having made “*unworthy efforts to involve in suspicion and distrust the motives by which the Missionary Secretaries were influenced in forming a coalition with the Upper Canada Conference.*”

Now, as to the *motives* of the Missionary Secretaries, any one who reads our Report with attention, will see that we have not impugned their motives—directly nor indirectly. We admitted that those very objects of absolute supremacy which they contemplated were justifiable under certain circumstances and to a certain extent. Our argument was, and is still, that the proceedings of the Missionary Secretaries have arisen, not from impure motives, but from erroneous views; erroneous views in supposing that the conference and people in this province were mere children, unfit to judge or act for themselves,—in supposing that the committee in London were the only authorised and duly qualified directors of operations in Canada—in short, that they were the wise, if not that wisdom would die with them.

As to the purport of Mr. Alder’s statement on this point before the committee of the late English Conference, I have only to repeat our assertion, and to say it was founded not only on distinct recollection, but on the minutes which I look at the time Mr. Alder made his statements. Mr. Alder said, “*one of the great designs of the union was, to bring the Methodism of Upper Canada to accord in all respects with the Methodism of England;*” that although “*the*

articles of union might at first sight appear not to give the English Conference much power, yet it would appear otherwise when they came to examine into the powers of the President, who was to be appointed by the English Conference. He had power to appoint all the Chairmen of Districts, and in connexion with them to station all the Preachers." "And it was understood (said Mr. A.) that the Missionary Committee had secured to themselves the power to send as many missionaries, young or old, as they might think proper, into any part of the Missionary work in Upper Canada."

Such was the purport of Mr. Alder's statement on this point; and Messrs. Stinson and Richey know it as well as I do. It will be seen that the means which Mr. Alder had supposed were secured to accomplish the end he contemplated, involves, to all intents and purposes the absolute ascendancy of which we spoke. But he found, that as great as were the powers of the President, &c., the ascendancy anticipated had not been realized.

And when it is recollected that the resolutions of the English Conference not only involve what was stated by Mr. Alder, but also that their President shall be *ex-officio* Representative of the Wesleyan Body in Canada in all communications with the Government or other Bodies,—that our official organ shall advocate the principle of Church establishments—and that the English Conference shall have an "efficient direction over the public proceedings" of the Canada Conference, one can only wonder at the hardihood of the assertion which Messrs. Stinson and Richey have made.

I must now call your attention to a most painful instance of disingenuousness and imposition on the part of Messrs. Stinson and Richey. On the 8th page of their pamphlet, they proceed as follows:

"Among the considerations which rendered such an arrangement at that period expedient, the following reasons are stated, in a letter addressed by our Missionary Secretaries to the Rev. Messrs. R. Williams and other British Missionaries in Canada:

"1. That the Upper Province is *adequately supplied* by the American Conference, as not to present that pressing case of necessity which will justify us in expending our funds upon it.

"2. That Mr. Emory has engaged, that *its full supply* by American Preachers, shall be, as far as possible, attended to."

Now the readers of this pamphlet would naturally suppose, from this representation of Messrs. Stinson and Richey, that such were the reasons which induced the Missionary Committee in 1820 to agree to confine their Missionaries to Lower Canada; whereas the fact is, that Messrs. Stinson and Richey, in extracting two sentences from the letter addressed by the Missionary Secretaries to the Rev. Messrs. R. Williams and other English Missionaries in Canada in 1820, conceal from their readers the fundamental and governing reasons for that arrangement with the American Conference. I will now quote the reasons which Messrs. Stinson and Richey have omitted:—[For these reasons the reader is referred to the extracts contained in the second resolution, in answer to Question II, on pages 104, 105, 106, and is particularly requested to read them before he proceeds any further.]

Now, if Messrs. Stinson and Richey intended to act a candid and honest part with their readers, why did they, in professing to give the reasons which influenced the decisions of the Missionary Secretaries in regard to Upper Canada in 1820, conceal from them the very principles and fundamental reasons on which those decisions were founded? They well knew that those principles and reasons condemn with irresistible authority their present course of proceeding. But is such a statement as they have made to their readers, in connexion with the concealment they have practised, true, or just, or honest? I leave any candid man of any party to judge.

Messrs. Stinson and Richey say, "that the compact between the States'

General Conference and that of England expired the moment that Conference ceased to exercise ecclesiastical control in Canada."

That is very true; but have the *Methodistic* and *moral principles* on which the English Conference itself declared that "compact" to be founded, ceased to exist? Those principles are immutable; and are as sacred and as obligatory in 1840 as they were in 1820; and the frowns of the Almighty, and the condemnatory execrations of the Methodistic and religious world must ultimately fall upon the heads of the violators of them—whoever they may be.

The Methodist Connexion in this Province is as much a legitimate branch of the great Wesleyan Family as that in England or in the United States, and has been so acknowledged and recognized by the English Conference itself; and for the Missionary Secretaries to establish rival and divisive operations in this Province in 1840, is as much a violation of the sacred and unchangeable principles of Methodistic oneness and unity, as it would have been for them to have prosecuted those operations in 1820, when the Methodist Church in this Province was connected with the Methodist General Conference in the United States. The Missionary Secretaries have hung the English Conference on one or the other of the horns of a most humiliating and awful dilemma. If the Methodist Connexion in this Province is not a legitimate Branch of Wesleyan Methodism, the English Conference have been deliberate parties to Methodistic schism up to the present time; if the Methodist Connexion in Upper Canada is a legitimate Branch of Wesleyan Methodism, then are the Missionary Secretaries deliberately guilty of Methodistic schism in their present operations in this Province.

On the 12th page of this pamphlet I am represented as having "pathetically urged" when in England, in 1833, the inability of this Conference to support its Missions, in order to induce the Committee in England to agree to the Union. The correctness of this statement may be judged of, when I remind you of two facts already known to many members of this Conference. The first is, that the Union itself was virtually decided upon by the Committee in London long before I went to England, from the resolutions of this Conference which Mr. Alder took to England in 1832, and the representation which he made. The second is, after our Conference of 1832, I hesitated about going to England at all, and wrote to Mr. Alder to that effect, and received a letter from him in reply, urging me by all means to come, as no difficulties would be found in the way of accomplishing the proposed arrangement.

But Messrs. Stinson and Richey also say, on the 16th page of their pamphlet, that Dr. Bunting could not suppress his feelings of surprise and indignation when he heard us, at the late English Conference, attempt to establish an opposite position. It is true, that Dr. Bunting did interrupt me in that part of my statement referred to, as he was accustomed to do at almost every stage of my observations, and asserted that he had a distinct recollection of my having stated to him in 1833 that we raised only £1000 a year in Upper Canada for Missionary purposes. My reply to Dr. Bunting was, that two things materially different in themselves had been confounded in his mind—the ability of the Canada Conference to sustain the Missions which it had already established, and its ability to extend those Missions commensurate with the wants of the new settlements and the fresh openings amongst the Indian Tribes; that on the latter ground the desirableness of the Union had been admitted and suggested by our Missionary Board in 1832, and had no doubt been stated by me in 1833, as that was my opinion; that, on the former ground, as stated by Mr. Alder in his letter to Lord John Russell (which was the topic then referred to) the Union never had been urged by me or by our Missionary Board; that I had put a copy of our Canadian Missionary Report into Dr. Bunting's hands when in England in 1833, and could not therefore be supposed to have made statements at variance with that; and that if he had allowed me to proceed in my statement without interruption, he would have found that I was just

about to state that the amount raised in Upper Canada that year for Missionary purposes, was £1038—which was within £38 of the sum which Dr. Bunting understood me to have stated in 1883. At this moment, Mr. John Mason, Conference Book Steward, rose, and interrupting, and addressing himself to me, said, "Sir, you told the late Richard Watson and me, in my house, that you could not sustain your Missions another year if we did not take charge of them." My answer to Mr. Mason was, that, to the best of my recollection, I was not in his house at all in 1833; that I never had the honour of seeing Mr. Watson, as he died several months before my first visit to England.

On the 27th page of this Pamphlet Messrs. Stinson and Richey state, that, in 1833, I gave the Committee in England pledges that the Guardian should not be the medium of discussing secular party politics. The nature of my pledges on this point, I explained at large in an Editorial article in the Guardian of December 4th, 1833, headed "Our Pledges." That article was read at the Hamilton Conference, last year, in the presence of Mr. Alder, and admitted by him to be correct. The occasion on which I wrote that article in the first place, was that I had been charged, not with having agreed in England to abstain from all discussion of secular questions, but with having sacrificed my principles and the rights of the People of Upper Canada on the question of the Clergy Reserves. In that very article I state, as I have always stated, that the discussion of secular party politics was to be waived on all sides; but that we were to exercise our uncontrolled discretion in our discussions and proceedings on the question of the Clergy Reserves.

After having referred to this understanding in England in 1833 in regard to the neutrality of the Guardian in secular politics, Messrs. Stinson and Richey, page 28, proceed thus:—

"From the assurance which they received from Mr. Ryerson, however, the committee were as perfectly satisfied that the Guardian would henceforth assume and maintain the character of a *proper religious and literary Journal*, as though that course had been prescribed for it in the articles of union, in terms the most perpicuous and inflexible.

"Many months—lamentable to relate—did not elapse, before the Committee deeply and painfully felt that some better security than Mr. Ryerson's verbal engagement, on this point, was rendered indispensable. Accordingly, at the Conference held in Kingston, in June, 1834, with the first appointed President, the Rev. E. Grindrod, in the Chair, this matter was brought under its serious consideration, and the following Resolutions, (*drawn up by the Editor*), were contemporaneously adopted:

"*Resolved*—That the *Christian Guardian*, as the organ of the Conference, shall be *properly and truly a religious and literary Journal*, to explain our doctrines and institutions, and in the spirit of meekness to defend them when necessary; to vindicate our character if expedient, when misrepresented; to maintain our religious privileges; to publish the operations of religious benevolence, and the triumphs of the Gospel throughout the world, more especially in relation to that section of the Christian Church, with which we are immediately connected.

"*Resolved*—That during the Sessions of Parliament, the editor shall be at liberty to publish a summary account of Parliamentary proceedings, as far as may be judged expedient, without interfering with the *great religious* objects of the publication, and *without reference to mere party interests or discussions*. He shall also be at liberty to give a weekly summary of Foreign and Domestic News.

"*Resolved*—That the *Christian Guardian* SHALL NOT BE THE MEDIUM OF DISCUSSING POLITICAL QUESTIONS, nor the merits of political parties, *as it is injurious to the interests of religion*, and DEROGATORY TO OUR CHARACTER as a religious body, to have our Church amalgamated or *identified* with any political party."

"Resolutions more stringent, promises larger or more luminous than these, in regard to the only matter which then seemed to interfere with the comforta-

ble working of the Union, the Committee and Conference in England could not desire. And although their confidence had been once abused, the cordial adoption by the Canadian Brethren of Resolutions so explicit and satisfactory, could not fail to resuscitate it."

In all the party and misstatements that I ever read, I never read a more gross perversion of truth than this. I am here represented, as having,—between the Conference of Oct. 1833, when the Union was consummated, and the ensuing Conference held in Kingston, June 1834,—so grossly violated the confidence reposed in me by the Committee in London, that they "*deeply and painfully felt* that some better security than my verbal engagement on this point, was *rendered indispensable!*" Now, does not every member of this Conference who was present at the Session held in Kingston, June 1834, know, that so far from having been complained of by Messrs. Grindrod and Alder, my course was objected to by that part of this Conference and Connection who were opposed to their political sentiments; that I was most decidedly sustained, both publicly and privately, by Messrs. Grindrod and Alder, who, on perceiving that many of my brethren were displeased with me, offered me a station in another Province. Is it not also within your recollection that Mr. Grindrod actually declared in Conference, that, if I were not re-elected Editor, the Union would be broken up? Is it not known to you that the resolutions quoted by Messrs. Stinson and Richey did not originate with Messrs. Grindrod and Alder; that they never requested, but merely acquiesced in them, in accordance with the demands of (if I may use the expression) the more liberal members of this conference. I myself drew up the resolutions with that view, and in order the more fully to satisfy those who had disapproved of the "*Impressions*" which had appeared in the Guardian, and which Mr. Grindrod pronounced most correct. The very announcement of the names of the mover and seconder of those resolutions will at once prove how entirely contrary to fact is the statement of Messrs. Stinson and Richey. They were moved by the Rev. JAMES RICHARDSON, and seconded by the Rev. FRANKLIN METCALF—than whom no two members of this conference were ever more opposed to the sentiments of Messrs. Grindrod and Alder. [A general response in the affirmative followed, on the part of the members of the conference, the utterance of each of these sentences.] And if there was a shadow of truth in Messrs. Stinson and Richey's statement, that I had, within a few months after my return from England in 1833, "*abused the confidence*" reposed in me by the committee in London, how did it happen that I continued to enjoy, in so high a degree, the confidence and friendship of the Representatives of the English Conference in this Province? How did it happen that I was so respectfully and cordially received by the Committee and Conference in England in 1836?

In connexion with the exposure of this extraordinary misstatement, I must call attention to one, if possible, still more humiliating and disgraceful. I will give it in Messrs. Stinson and Richey's own words. In giving a brief view of the violation of these resolutions of 1834, from the time of their adoption to the Hamilton Conference of 1839, Messrs. Stinson and Richey, page 32, proceed as follows:—

"Scarcely had the *first* appointed President time to recross the Atlantic, and announce, as one of the accomplishments of his mission, the procuring, in conjunction with Dr. Alder, the adoption of the resolutions for the future regulation of the *Guardian*, when Mr. Ryerson's avowed '*inclination*' and sense of '*required duty*' yielded to his dominant though for a time slumbering propensity; he began to think that it was not upon the whole best altogether to leave '*secular affairs* to be managed by secular men.'

"The *forbearance* and *long-suffering* which the British Conference has exercised in regard to this gross violation of faith, persisted in by the Rev. E. Ryerson, sanctioned and upheld in his course by a large majority of his brethren, in

the very face of *their own* legislative enactments, is proof most ample of the sincere and even tenacious solicitude of the Parent Body, if possible, to maintain the Union. It was not until they had just grounds to apprehend the serious implication of their public reputation, hitherto untarnished, and even *above suspicion*; it was not until the Resolutions of 1834 were evidently and flagrantly treated as a dead and inoperative document, without obligation and without meaning, that they were aroused to the importance of acting in the case with some decision. And even then, instead of abruptly signifying to the Upper Canada Conference, as *they righteously might have done*, that they considered the Union virtually dissolved by the incorrigible and increasingly aggravated infractions, by the *Guardian*, of the solemn stipulations of 1834, they resolved to try once more the effect of counsel and conciliation, and deputed Dr. Alder, at considerable expense, as well as serious disadvantage to their Mission funds, to attend the Conference at Hamilton, for that purpose."

The clear and distinct impression which the perusal of these paragraphs is calculated to make upon the mind of the reader, is, 1. That from 1834 to 1839, there was no other Editor of the *Guardian* but Egerton Ryerson: 2. That during that entire period he continued to try the "forbearance and long suffering" of the English Conference, by a "gross violation of faith" and public duty! Yet who does not know that during THREE years of those FIVE years, Mr. EPHRAIM EVANS was Editor of the *Guardian*? And who does not know, and how many hundreds feel, the *political* course which he pursued? But to that I shall advert presently.

In our London Pamphlet, we have stated, and Messrs. Stinson and Richey have not ventured to deny it, that Mr. Alder said before the committee of the late English Conference, that he never heard any complaints respecting the *Guardian*, as far as I was concerned, from the Conference of 1834 to the latter part of 1838 and the beginning of 1839. In confirmation of this fact, I appeal to the enumeration of letters and documents which the committee of the late English Conference report to have been read to them. It will there be seen that the first complaints which were transmitted from this Province to London against the Editor of the *Guardian*, are reported to have been contained in letters written by Mr. Stinson, and dated October and November, 1838. Subsequently, after the Governor General assumed the Government of Upper Canada, complaints were sent to London by Messrs. Stinson and Richey, dated January, February, and March, 1840.

Now, I admit that the resolutions of 1834 had fallen into disuse—had virtually become as Messrs. Stinson and Richey express it, "a dead and inoperative document." But under whose auspices and by whom were those resolutions nullified? Not by me; but by Mr. EPHRAIM EVANS, and with the *approval* and under the *auspices* of the REPRESENTATIVES OF THE ENGLISH CONFERENCE. I was not even in the country—I was absent in England—during more than eighteen months (from November 1835 to June 1837) of the most political part of the political career of those gentlemen, when they revolutionized a whole House of Assembly, and carried on a large business in general provincial politics, and now and then dealt in the political affairs of our American neighbours;—a period during which, as you will all recollect, Mr. Alder said, at our Hamilton Conference of 1839, he "considered the *Guardian* a capital paper." Here, I confess, were three years' nullification of the resolutions of 1834; or, if Messrs. Stinson and Richey's representation of the design of those resolutions be true, "a gross violation of faith." And when some of the members of this Conference, at the Session held in this city, June, 1837, objected to Mr. EVANS's political discussion, did not Mr. HARVARD, the Representative of the English Conference, justify the course which Mr. EVANS had pursued? I perceive that the Chairman of the Toronto District, Rev. A. Green, has anticipated me. I was just about to appeal to Mr. Green on this point; but he has saved me trouble by sending me note, from which I will read what I was about to state. Mr. GREEN says—"Mr. HARVARD wished

me to move a resolution in Conference, (1837,) to the effect, that the Editor of the Guardian might be at liberty to discuss political questions." But Mr. Green objected, stating that he was conscientiously opposed to political discussions of any kind in the columns of the Guardian.

And now, in the face of all these facts, Messrs. Stinson and Richey come before the public and charge me with "a gross violation of faith" in having reduced the resolutions of 1834 to "a dead and inoperative document." Sir, those resolutions had received the sentence of death—had been executed, and buried, by Messrs. EVANS, STINSON, and HARVARD before my return from England in 1837, and a twelvemonth before my re-appointment to the Editorship of the Guardian. And my re-appointment to that office, in June, 1838, took place, not with any reference to the resolutions of 1834. (which were never understood by this Conference as any stipulation with the English Conference, but a spontaneous and independent regulation of its own,) but, if you please, under a different dispensation—a state of things introduced by Messrs. Evans and the Representatives of the English Conference, and which rendered a decided position and strong discussion on our part absolutely unavoidable. I shall prove that I came into the Editorship with the avowed and understood object of pursuing the very course that I did, and with the support and suffrages of Messrs. STINSON and RICHEY themselves. [Here the Rev. John Ryerson put into the hands of the speaker a letter from the Rev. J. Stinson, and directing his attention to a particular paragraph.] I was about to state the circumstances under which I was chosen and engaged to serve you as your Editor in 1838; but a letter (of the existence of which I never before heard) from Mr. Stinson, relative to my election, has just been put into my hands. It will show the views and feelings of Mr. Stinson in relation to myself, after five years' intimate acquaintance with me, and his views also in reference to the objects contemplated by my election. Mr. Richey was also known to entertain the same views with Mr. Stinson, and voted for me as Editor, in opposition to Mr. Evans. This letter is dated Kingston, April 7, 1838. The extract to which my attention has been directed is as follows:

"I am quite of your opinion that Br. Egerton ought to take the Guardian next year, if he do not go Home. Br. Evans has done well upon the whole; but there is a crisis approaching in our affairs which will require a more vigorous hand to wield the defensive weapon of our Conference. There can be no two opinions as to whom to give that weapon. We now stand on fair grounds to maintain our own against the encroachments of the oligarchy, and we must do it, or sink into a comparatively unimportant body. This must not be."

I have been recently attacked by a political newspaper, published in this city, in copying a letter which I wrote to an anti-slavery advocate in England, stating what I had said to this Conference, previously to my election as Editor in 1838; viz., that I would not make the Guardian the medium of discussing the internal affairs of the Methodist Episcopal Church in the United States, or of attacking the form of government in that country, any more than I would attack other forms of Church Government, differing from our own—contenting myself with supporting our own institutions without attacking those of others. You all know that it was after I made those declarations that both Messrs.

* *Note.*—Some discussion arose in a subsequent sitting of the Conference, as to whether this letter was a confidential letter; when it was shown to be a business letter. It is, however, worthy of remark that Messrs. Stinson and Richey in their pamphlet, refer to many conversations and verbal statements in connexion with myself in order to make out their case; and from the enumeration of letters read before the Committee of the English Conference, it will be seen that private letters from and about me were read and had their influence in the proceedings of that Committee. I have no desire to retaliate, by employing, as I might do, letters from Messrs. Stinson and Richey, as well as from others who have left the Conference. I am contented to rest the whole case on an appeal to public and official documents.

Stinson and Richey voted for me as Editor.—You also know that when I expressed my views as to my intended course on the question of the Clergy Reserves, and that I would treat the Church of England with the same respect that I did the Church of Scotland, or any other Protestant Church, and with no more, Mr. Lang said he hoped my opinions were not to be taken as the opinions of the Conference. Mr. Stinson arose, and said he agreed with Brother Egerton Ryerson—that he (Mr. S.) believed the Clergy of the Episcopal Church in this Province to be the worst enemies to Methodism in the Province—that he (Mr. S.) did not think so when he first came to this country, but five years' residence and travelling here had convinced him of the fact.

So much on ecclesiastical affairs. Now for the circumstances in relation to the *discussion of civil affairs* under which Messrs. STINSON and RICHEY voted for me. You will all recollect that I explained my views at large in regard to the peculiar circumstances of this country, and our position and duty as a Body. In my Editorial prospectus, on assuming the management of the Guardian, July 11, 1838, I recapitulated the substance of what I had stated before this Conference. I will here read that part of it which relates to the discussion of civil affairs :

"To the very natural and important inquiry, in relation to *civil affairs*, "do you intend to be neutral?" I answer, no, I do not; and for this simple reason, I am a man, am a British subject, am a professing Christian, and represent a British community. At one period in Greece, Solon enacted a law inflicting capital punishment upon all *neuters*. The present is a period in the affairs of this Province in which no man of intelligence or consideration can be safely or justifiably *neutral*. The foundation of our government is being laid anew—the future character, and relations and destinies of the country are involved in pending deliberations—the last whisper of rebellion is to be silenced in the land. My decision, however, is not one of *party*, but of *principle*—not one of *passion*, but of *conviction*—not one of *partial proscription*, but of *equitable comprehensiveness*. To be explicit as well as brief, I am opposed to the introduction of any new and untried theories of Government. As the organ of the Methodist Church, I assume that the doctrines and discipline of that Church are true and right—I take them for granted as far as the members of that Church are concerned, and expound, and recommend, and act upon them accordingly. So in civil affairs, I assume that this country is to remain a portion of the British Empire, and view every measure, not in reference to every or any abstract political theory, however plausible that theory may be, but in reference to the well-being of the country in connexion with Great Britain. As in Church affairs, I take my stand upon the Constitution of the Church, in its doctrines and rules, as expounded by its fathers and ablest theologians, and illustrated by general usage; so in civil affairs, I take my stand upon the established Constitution of the country, as expounded by Royal Despatches, and illustrated by the usages of the British Parliament, British Courts of Justice, and the Common Law of England. Nothing more is wanted to render this Province happy and prosperous, than the practical and efficient application to every department of our Government, and to our whole system of legislation, of the principles and instructions laid down in the Despatch of the Earl of Ripon, addressed to Sir John Colborne, dated 8th November, 1832, and the Despatch of Lord Glenelg, addressed to Sir F. Head, dated 15th Dec., 1835.

"In conclusion,—it is but just that the readers of the *Guardian* and the public should know, that the foregoing article contains a mere summary of what I avowed before the late Conference, in a lengthened address of some hours, previous to being elected to my present office by a ballot vote of 41 to 16.—I feel therefore strongly sanctioned in those principles, and views, and purposes, as well as strongly confident in my own mind. But I am deeply sensible of my fallibility, I pretend to no exemption from the ordinary errors and infirmities of humanity, I confess myself liable even to imprudencies. In promoting, therefore, the varied objects of the *Guardian*, I must crave the indulgence and forbearance of its readers, as well as hope for their confidence and support—depending primarily, ultimately, and entirely, upon the favour of Him without whose blessing nothing is wise, or good, or strong."

Such were the views on the exposition of which Messrs. Stinson and Richey voted for my appointment as Editor in 1838. I will now ask, if, as a man of common honor and honesty, after having been elected Editor under such circumstances, I was not as much bound to discuss civil questions in 1838, as I was bound not to discuss them in 1834? But it appeared in the course of a few months, that Sir George Arthur espoused the cause of the high church "oligarchy," when the fair-weather courage of Messrs. Stinson and Richey forsook them; and when the Missionary Secretaries, shortly after, wrote out a laudatory letter to Sir George Arthur, and another letter to Mr. Stinson, condemnatory of the Editor of the Guardian, Messrs. Stinson and Richey, instead of acknowledging their participation in my election with a view to those very discussions, tacked about, and, having no judgment or opinions of their own, but being the mere automatons of the Missionary Secretaries, they began at once to echo the sentiments newly imported from Hatton Garden, to adopt the shibboleths of the "oligarchy" against me, and have at length become valiant champions of "the established Church in all the British Colonies." And now the burden of their cry, and the theme of their Pamphlet, is, that I have violated the Resolutions of 1834 in discussing questions of civil polity! Sir, whatever variety of opinion may be entertained of the wisdom or folly, the inflexibility or conciliation, of my course of proceeding, but one opinion can be entertained respecting the conduct of Messrs. Stinson and Richey in this whole affair. I will submit it to the judgment of any candid man of any party, whether the Representatives of the English Conference had not, by their own acts, become as much responsible for these discussions, and as much parties to them, as this Conference, or any member of it? I will ask, if it is consistent, or just, or honorable,—after the disannulling of the Resolutions of 1834 by the co-operation of their own Representatives during the three years of Mr. Evans' Editorial career, and with the tacit sanction of the English Conference,—for the committee in London, much less for Messrs. Stinson and Richey, now to come forward and impugn me, and declare the obligations of the Union violated, in consequence of the non-observance of the Resolutions of 1834? When all the circumstances of the progress and dissolution of the Union are carefully investigated, together with the conduct of the English Representatives in connexion with the ecclesiastical and civil affairs of this Province, I will venture to say, that the proceedings of the authorities of the late English Conference will be found to be without a parallel in the annals of modern Protestant Church History, and the conduct of Messrs. Stinson and Richey, without many appropriate appellations in the vocabulary of the English language.

It is also known that at the earliest possible moment after the accomplishment of the two great constitutional measures of His Excellency the Governor General's temporary administration of the affairs of this Province, I withdrew the Guardian from civil discussions of every kind; I improved the first opportunity to withdraw from the Guardian myself, and disconnected myself as well as this Body, as far as I was concerned, from every sort of politics or parties. All this transpired before the late English Conference, and was perfectly well known to its authorities. And at this moment it is known to all men that we are not responsible for the acts of any party—are connected with no party—are, as I hope we may always be, on friendly terms with the Government and with the great majority of our fellow-subjects.

In view of these facts, and in view of the proceedings of the authorities of the late English Conference, I submit to any intelligent man, whether it is not rather our non-politics than our politics which are so odious to the Missionary Secretaries? We are not prepared to resign our judgments and consciences to their "co-ordinate but *efficient direction*;" we cannot incorporate the principle of Church establishments as a part of Wesleyan Methodism in this country, and make the Christian Guardian the organ of its advocacy; I have satisfied the Government of the fact,—of which it seems not to have been aware

heretofore,—that making grants to the Missionary Committee in London was not aiding the Institutions of our Church; that the authorities of the Church in this Province were the proper medium of aiding the Church in this Province. Here were the head and front of our offending; here are the real grounds of the dissolution of the Union. The plea of politics is a mere manœuvre of party—is a figment of the imagination—has no foundation in reality.

But Messrs. Stinson and Richey assert, on the 33rd page of this Pamphlet, that the real object of Mr. Alder's designation to this Province in 1839 was "neither to require of the Upper Canada Conference the *advocacy* of the principle of Church Establishments, nor to *oppose the discussion of the Clergy Reserve Question in the Conference Journal.*" Now, who could have supposed, that at the time Messrs. Stinson and Richey published this statement, Mr. Stinson had in his possession a letter from the London Wesleyan Committee, written and signed by Mr. Alder himself a few weeks before he sailed for Canada, stating the very reverse? In proof of what I now state, I will merely read three sentences from Mr. Alder's official letter to Mr. Stinson, dated January 14, 1839. Mr. Alder says—

"I admit that a difference in circumstances between one country and another,—as for instance between an old country and a newly settled country,—may render it necessary and expedient, that the principle of what is commonly called '*the Church and State Question,*' should be so applied as to meet and adapt itself to this difference; but, UNDER NO CIRCUMSTANCES, should the PRINCIPLE itself be CONCEDED or abandoned.—It is the undoubted right of every Methodist in Upper Canada to form, and, on all proper occasions, to express his opinions on the CLERGY RESERVE QUESTION; but WE think that in giving utterance to their opinions, and especially in acting upon them, they should appear in the character of *citizens, and not in that of Methodists*:—and I must add, in *behalf of my colleagues and myself*, THAT THE OFFICIAL ORGAN OF THE CONNEXION OUGHT NOT TO BE IDENTIFIED WITH SUCH PROCEEDINGS."

But suppose, in the face of this indubitable evidence, that the statement of Messrs. Stinson and Richey were true, in what light would the proceedings of the authorities of the English Conference in 1839 and 1840 appear? According to Messrs. Stinson and Richey, they do not require, in 1839, the *advocacy* of the principle of Church Establishments; but in 1840 they require us to "*admit and maintain* it in the official organ of this Connexion," and that even as a principle of Wesleyan Methodism.

If this principle is Methodistic and sacred in 1840, was it not equally so in 1839? If its advocacy was not required in 1839, why is it required in 1840? Into what inconsistencies and self-contradictions do men and bodies of men fall, who depart from the simple path of truth and righteousness!

On the 34th page of this Pamphlet, Messrs. Stinson and Richey say—

"We proceed to a *second* ground of complaint, on the part of the British Conference, *against* the Rev. E. Ryerson, in regard to which he found an overwhelming majority of his brethren to sustain him at the Belleville Conference in June last:

"A violation of the obligations arising from the Union, in not opposing, but rather countenancing, the payment of our Grant, in a certain contingency, not to us, but to the Upper Canada Conference, for other and different purposes."

This Messrs. Stinson and Richey inform their readers was the charge preferred against me, and which the authorities of the English Conference decided was *fully proved*. Now, so far from this being true, Messrs. Stinson and Richey keep out of sight of their readers the real charge preferred against me, and which was decided by the authorities of the English Conference to be *fully*

proved.—Any one who reads the Resolutions of the London Committee, dated April 29th, 1840, will find that the charge against me was as follows :

"2. That in the judgment of this Committee, Mr. Ryerson has discovered an *utter want of ingenuousness and integrity* in thus attempting to gain possession, in behalf of the Canadian Conference, in whole or in part, of the Grant made by the Crown to the Wesleyan Missionary Society, and that he has in this matter committed a *flagrant violation of the obligations arising from the union between the two Conferences.*"

Are such misquotations dealing honestly with their readers? Does a good cause require them? It will be seen that there is a material difference between the passage quoted by Messrs. Stinson and Richey as the "second charge" against me, and the real charge preferred by the Committee. Such a proceeding needs no farther comment.

Then they make a long and laborious effort to obviate the force of the Governor General's testimony. The whole matter on this point may be summed up in a few words. I made application for aid to the Upper Canada Academy. His Excellency supposed that this Connexion already received aid from Government. I laid documents before him which satisfied him that no aid had been given to it. After inquiring into the matter, he was of opinion that aid had been intended for our Connexion in this Province, and ought to be given to it, and determined to write to the Secretary of State for the Colonies on the subject,—recommending that the Grant heretofore given to the Wesleyan Missionary Committee should be varied in its mode of distribution,—proposing that one half of it should be given to this Conference in aid of the U. C. Academy. With that answer to my application, (which was afterwards embodied in a written memorial in behalf of the Trustees of the U. C. Academy, a copy of which I have with me,) I was satisfied. Let it be observed, then, once for all, that I sought aid for the U. C. Academy; respecting the fund out of which that might be given I had nothing to do; His Excellency the Governor General proposed to bestow that aid by varying the distribution of a particular Grant, which he conceived had not been disposed of in the way, or did not accomplish the objects intended. His Excellency says it was without any application from me he examined into the origin and circumstances of that grant, and determined to write to Lord John Russell, explaining "the grounds upon which he is of opinion that the grant should be distributed in a manner different from that which has of late been followed." I know not how it is possible for language to be more explicit. I could only wish that His Excellency's Despatch to Lord John Russell might be made public. That would explain the whole question. It is very true His Excellency's views and intentions may be overruled by higher authority; but that cannot alter the facts of the past.

I will next request your attention to Messrs. Stinson and Richey's exposition of their Memorial to the Governor General, in connection with the Clergy Reserve Bill. They assert "upon information derived from a respectable source," that that Bill "was drawn up in accordance with my wishes," and "so as to annihilate for ever the claim of the English Conference to any portion of the Reserves." This is their justification for writing the memorial. Let us examine it. They do not tell us the source of their information. That is an important omission. And had they inquired of Mr. Attorney General Draper (who I believe was the framer of the Bill) they would have learned that that Bill was drawn up not only without my assistance, but without my knowledge; and that I never saw it, until I saw it in print, by order of the House of Assembly. In the next place, that Bill never excluded any Christian denomination recognized by the Laws of Upper Canada. It did not name any Body of Methodists, nor any church except the Churches of England and Scotland, and therefore no more included Wesleyan Methodists connected with the Canada Conference, than those connected with the English Conference.

But this "equal justice to all classes" did not satisfy Messrs. Stinson and Richey; they, therefore, petitioned His Excellency, that the sum to be appropriated to the Methodists "be given to the Wesleyan Methodists who are now, AND WHO MAY BE HEREAFTER CONNECTED WITH THE BRITISH WESLEYAN CONFERENCE." This is their prayer, and that in connection with the announcement to His Excellency that the *Union would be dissolved*. And yet they tell you, that they did not intend to exclude this Body from the provisions of the Bill. No, generous and liberal men, they did not wish to *exclude us*; all they wanted was, *not to include us*. They add, at the same time,—“we had sufficient reason to believe that no representation or request of ours would, at the time, be considered entitled to much consideration.” This imputation upon the Governor General is only an involuntary ebullition of a feeling which Messrs. Stinson and Richey have indulged, with little restraint on other occasions, against His Excellency, during the whole of his administration; whilst I and my friends have employed no little labour to promote, at a season of extreme importance and difficulty, the great objects of his government.

Again, Messrs. Stinson and Richey state (page 47) that “Yet, after all, the British Conference, with an *unlimited charity*, admitting the possibility of their being in error, in regard to his (Mr. Ryerson's) delinquency in the affair (of the grant) as fully established, *generously* afforded him an opportunity of completely dissipating the cloud which overhung him. They proposed that he should address a letter to Lord John Russell, disclaiming any intention or wish to deprive the Missionary Society of the grant—requesting the continuance of the regular payment,” &c. &c.

Let us analyse this proceeding of “unlimited charity,” and see if it will not be found a part and parcel of a deliberately-formed scheme to complete my ruin, as all efforts to purchase, or to terrify me, had thus far proved abortive, and, at the same time, to make gain of me to the London Committee. When Messrs. Stinson and Richey made this statement, they knew perfectly well that my brother and I had both stated to the Committee of the late English Conference, that we had already seen Lord John Russell, and informed his Lordship of his misapprehension of the design of my letter to the Governor-General, dated January 17, 1840—that we had explained to his Lordship the circumstances under which that Letter was written—that that letter contained no application for anything, but a simple exposition of the financial relations of the English and Canadian Conferences, drawn up in compliance with the request of the Governor-General—that I was prepared to state that to Lord John Russell at any time and in any form. But, Sir, such a letter would not satisfy the Missionary Secretaries; they would be satisfied with nothing short of MY ADVOCATING THE CONTINUANCE OF THAT GRANT TO THEM, in opposition to my own sense of right and wrong, as well as in opposition to the known recommendation of His Excellency the Governor-General.

But when do they require me to write a letter of this character to Lord John Russell? Why, after their own solemn decision, that it had been “fully proved,” that I had “discovered an *utter want of ingenuousness and integrity* in attempting to get possession of that grant.” After such a decision, as if to add injury to insult, they call upon me to disclaim in writing what they had decided was “fully proved,” and, in addition, to become their advocate to the Government for a grant to them of £700 a-year! And such an unheard-of proceeding, Messrs. Stinson and Richey call the “unlimited charity of the British Conference.” If such be their “unlimited charity,” what must be their “unlimited” vengeance? Such may indeed be the “unlimited charity” of certain members of the English Conference; but I am persuaded that it is such “charity” as is abhorrent to the feelings of more than three-fourths of the members of that Conference, and was not understood by one-fourth of those who were induced to give their votes for it.

Then, Sir, as to the difference in the amounts of expenditure reported in the Missionary Reports in this Province and in England, Mr. Alder had stated to

Lord John Russell that the amount expended in Upper Canada since the Union was £17,806 18s 11d. sterling. We showed that according to Mr. Stinson's Canadian Reports, for the same period, the total amount expended was £13,475 1s 4d. sterling; £4,331 17s 7d. less than the sum stated by Mr. Alder. We added—"The manner in which this sum of £4,331 17s 7d. sterling, has been expended has not been stated in the Society's Reports, either in London or in Canada. It remains for Mr. Alder to explain."

On this Messrs. Stinson and Richey remark—"One, if not both of the Messrs. Ryerson knew, when they made this statement, that there are numerous heavy expenses incurred in carrying on our Missionary operations in Upper Canada, which never appear in the Colonial Report, because not charged upon any Colonial fund, nor coming under the supervision of any colonial committee, but which are published in the General Report of the Society."

I would here ask, in the first place, if all the Missionary expenditures of this Province are not out of *identically the same* Fund? Who ever heard before of Missionary expenses in Upper Canada being charged upon different funds? Who ever heard before of there being more than one Fund for them to be charged upon? This is an extraordinary announcement, and one that cannot fail to awaken inquiry. But Messrs. Stinson and Richey say, that these expenses, not accounted for in the Colonial Reports, are published in the *General Reports*, published in London. This statement is unfounded, as any man may satisfy himself who will examine the Reports of the Parent Society; for there the sum total of each year's reported expenditure in Upper Canada is entered, and no details whatever; so that the manner in which the sum of £4,331 17s. 7d. sterling; or, including the difference of exchange and currency, the sum of \$21,000 during the last seven years, has been expended, remains unaccounted for and unexplained in both the London and Colonial Missionary Reports. I do not say how this sum of \$3,000 a year has been expended; but I assert that the how is yet unaccounted for. Messrs. Stinson and Richey profess to account for it; but their Pamphlet and the *Missionary Reports* are very different affairs. Messrs. Stinson and Richey say it has been expended in sending out five missionaries to this Province—an expense of not more than £150, the way those missionaries came out—and in the payment of the several Agents of the British Conference in this Province, and in Mr. Alder's semi-political mission to this country. This is the manner in which I supposed this enormous sum had been expended; but still the details are not forthcoming from any quarter. But let it be known that the English Conference superintending agency in this little province has cost three thousand dollars a year during the last seven years, independent of the current expenses of the missions. But under the pressure of this scrutiny, Messrs. Stinson and Richey are driven to state, that considerable sums were paid to Messrs. Jones and Sunday, when in England. I beg to know, if the labours and appeals of Messrs. Jones and Sunday, when in England, did not bring in large revenues to the Missionary Societies? They also descend to say, that from £50 to £100, included in this amount, was paid to me while in England. In reply to this, I beg to say that I never received a farthing from the Missionary Committee in my life. I have accounts in my possession which show that the Financial Secretary of the Missionary Society paid my landlady for my board, during a part of my stay in London. But upon what ground? Why, upon the ground that I preached twice a day the majority of Sabbaths during my stay there—that I preached missionary sermons, and attended missionary meetings in various parts of London and the neighbourhood—in Birmingham, Manchester, Bolton, Liverpool, Chester, Sheffield, Leeds, Bradford, and various neighbouring villages.

Again, Messrs. Stinson and Richey say—

"Respecting the Indian Missions, the statements are plainly contradicted by the Reports referred to. Instead of 'upwards of 1000 Indians in Church Communion,' there were *only* 803."

Now, any one who will examine the Journals of this Conference, or the Printed Minutes of 1833, will find the number of Indian Members reported to have been 1,015.

On the subject of our treatment in every respect by the authorities of the English Conference, the statements which my brother has made, and the letters which have been read, and which were written by us the third day after our arrival at Newcastle-Upon-Tyne, and before the decisions of the remaining minority of the Conference took place, have more than confirmed what was stated in our Report; and will supersede the necessity of any further remarks from me.

Messrs. Stinson and Richey admit that Mr. Stinson wrote a letter to the Missionary Committee in March last, saying—"I have lost all confidence in the men with whom I act; and if you choose to degrade yourselves, any longer by a connexion with such men, I hope you will permit me to retire from the Province." But Messrs. Stinson and Richey explain, that by the *men with whom he acted*, he did not mean the Members of this Conference generally, but "Mr. E. Ryerson, and a few others." What a subterfuge! Did Mr. Stinson except these when he made his unqualified declarations of affection and respect, and his desire for the continuance of the Union at the Belleville Conference in June last? And was the *Union* (spoken of as a degradation) formed with "Mr. E. Ryerson and a few others," or was it formed with the whole Conference? Better have been silent on the subject, than to have attempted an explanation which involves self-contradiction and absurdity upon the very face of it.

Then, finally, Mr. Richey denies that he ever said he had been *treated* in Upper Canada "as a stranger, a foreigner, and an alien"—but states that he said he *felt* himself a stranger, &c. On this statement I have two remarks to make. 1. In my minutes made at the time, Mr. Richey's statement is recorded, and in subsequent discussions in the Committee of the English Conference, and it was referred to, just as we have reported it, and we never heard it denied before.

2. Mr. Richey admits that he said he *felt* himself "a stranger, a foreigner, and an alien." Now how he could assert that he *felt* as "a stranger, a foreigner and an alien," and yet, as he says, "it never entered his heart to *conceive*" that he was *treated* as such, is to assert an *effect* without a *cause*. Mr. Richey's own admission, therefore, contradicts his own assertion, and establishes the truth of our statement.

I have now, with as much brevity as possible, examined Messrs. Stinson and Richey's statements and assertions. They attempted to disprove our Report and Pamphlet; in what point have they succeeded? They attempted to vindicate Mr. Alder and the authorities of the English Conference; in what point have they not failed? But there are many things which they have not even attempted, which ought to have employed their attention and efforts, if they had ought to say. We had shown, in refutation of Mr. Alder's statements to Lord John Russell, that Mr. Wesley did intend that the United States' Conference should send missionaries into the British Provinces; that large sums of money were *not* expended in Upper Canada to repair "dilapidated buildings;" that the withdrawal of the Government grants had *not* lessened the number of missionaries employed amongst the Indians; that the Union *was* contemplated when the Government grant was made to the Committee in London. We had also shown the unfair enumeration of documents in the Report of the committee of the late English Conference; and that our business was kept out of the Conference until the 380 members, stated in the London Wesleyan Magazine to have been present at the beginning of the Session, had been reduced to 80. On all these important points, Messrs. Stinson and Richey are profoundly silent; and for very obvious reasons.

On the general subject of violating, and dissolving the Articles of the Union, I cannot do better than read the following extract of an Editorial article of the

London *Patriot* of the 1st of October, received this day. The Editor,—who is the author of the elaborate work called the *Modern Traveller*, and several other popular works,—remarks as follows :

“ In another column we have printed the ‘Articles of Union between the Wesleyan Conference in England and the Conference of the Wesleyan Methodist Church in Canada,’ as they are set forth in the Pamphlet published by the Messrs. Ryerson, referred to in our late Number. We have printed these Articles in our Journal from a wish to do justice to both parties, and that our Readers, generally, may have the means of forming their own opinions upon the points in dispute.

“ A careful examination of these Articles, and of the whole of the documents on both sides, as given by the Messrs. Ryerson, must, we think, lead to the conclusion, that NO VIOLATION OF THE ARTICLES in any particular, HAS BEEN COMMITTED BY THE CANADIAN CONFERENCE. By those Articles, it is expressly provided, that ‘the rights and privileges of the Canadian Preachers and Societies shall be preserved inviolate;’ that is, if the words have any meaning, that the Canadian preachers and societies shall not be subject to the dictation or dominant control of the British Conference. In the teeth of this, the first and fundamental Article, the British Conference actually arraign and condemn a Canadian preacher; interfere respecting a publication of the Canadian body; transmit to that body the result of their deliberations; and then, because the Canadian Conference refuse to confirm these proceedings by the sanction of their vote, the British Conference declare the union to be ended *de jure* and *de facto*. Is it not plain, then, that the *rent* in the united body is to be ascribed to the British Conference, and to them alone?

“ Again; inasmuch as no violation of the Articles of Union was committed by the Canadians, how could the British Conference be warranted in declaring the Union to be dissolved? The *British* Methodists were the aggressors; and it might, therefore, be competent to the Canadians to say to them, ‘You have broken the Articles of Union, and, therefore, we resolve to separate from you.’ But it is not for an aggressor to take advantage of his own wrong. The case may be compared to that of a commercial partnership. Two parties bind themselves to carry on trade together under certain articles of agreement. In the course of time, one partner, finding, perhaps, that he cannot rule in everything, says, ‘I dissolve the partnership, and it is dissolved accordingly.’ Would any court of equity, or of justice, in the land, support a man in this conduct? Suppose that the British Conference had embarked property in Canada for the purpose of extending Methodism there, would they, under the circumstances, have any remedy against the Canadian Conference for its recovery?

“ We adverted, in a former article, to the tone of superiority assumed by the British Conference in all their transactions with their Canadian brethren. Although the Articles of Union provide for the perfect equality of the two bodies, we look in vain for the recognition of such equality by the British Conference. On all occasions there has been, on the part of that body, the exhibition of conscious superiority. They claim to judge of the tone and politics of the Canadian organ. They arraign the conduct of a Canadian minister. The Canadian Conference were to be the recording ministers of British Methodist decrees; and, when the Canadians ventured to show a little spirit in the maintenance of rights which it was expected they had surrendered for ever, they are told, with lordly arrogance, that they are dismissed, and that the Union is at an end. All this may be capital Methodistic policy, but it does not at all accord with our notions of freedom and equality. The personal treatment of the Messrs. Ryerson by the [authorities of the] British Conference is a further illustration of this overbearing spirit. Upon this subject we will say no more, except to express our conviction that such conduct is equally opposed to the spirit which Christianity teaches, and to the best interests of the Methodist Connexion.”

I cannot conclude without offering two or three general remarks. The first relates to myself personally. I am aware that a combined effort has been determined upon and is making to destroy me as a public man, and to injure this Connexion as far as my overthrow can affect it. I rejoice to know that the strength and efficiency of our Church are not depending upon me; but I am not insensible to the advantages which it is supposed will be gained over the Church if I can be put down. Our adversaries seem to have abandoned the idea of answering my arguments, or of diverting me from my purposes, in regard to my position, and views, and feelings towards this Connexion. The only expedient left is that which requires no strength of intellect—no solid arguments—no real merit—no moral principle,—but abundance of confidence, malignity, and zeal. It is the expedient of *impeaching my moral integrity, and blackening my character*. And this is attempted to be accomplished by one class of adversaries, not by an appeal to reason, or even to official documents, but by the importation and retail from one side of the Atlantic to the other, and from one end of the Province to the other, and from house to house, of bits and parcels of perverted private conversations—a mode of warfare disgraceful to human nature, much more to any Christian community. History apprises me, that, in such a warfare, some of the best of men have not triumphed until long after they slept in death, when the hand of time and the researches of impartial history did them that justice which the cupidity and jealousies of powerful contemporaries denied them. I know not the present result of existing combinations against myself. On that point I feel little concern, though I am keenly alive to their influence upon my public usefulness. I engaged in the *Union*, because I believed the principles upon which it was founded were reasonable, and the prejudices against it on all sides were unreasonable. I do not regret the oppositions I have experienced—the reproaches I have incurred—the labours I have endured; but I do regret—and every day's reflection adds fresh poignancy to my regrets—that in carrying out a measure which I had hoped would have proved an unspeakable blessing to my native country, I have lost so many FRIENDS OF MY YOUTH. No young man in Canada had more friends amongst all Christian denominations, than I had when the *Union* took place. Many of them have become my enemies. I can lose property without concern or much thought; but I cannot lose friends, and meet them in the character of enemies, without emotions not to be described. I feel that I have injured myself, and injured this Connexion, and I fear injured this Province, not by my obstinacy, but by my CONCESSIONS. This is my sin, and not the sins laid to my charge. I have regarded myself, and all that Providence has put into my hands from year to year as the property of this Connexion. I can say, in the language of Wesley's Hymn—

" No foot of land do I possess,
No cottage in this wilderness;
A poor wayfaring man."

And it is to me a source of unavailing grief, that after the expenditure of so much time, and labour, and suffering, and means, not one of the most important measures of my life may prove a misfortune to the Church of my affections and the country of my birth. I have only to say, that as long as there is any prospect of my being useful to either, I will never desert them.

A second remark relates to the state of society in this Province. It is known to consist of a population congregated from various parts of the British Empire, and to a limited extent, in some places, of natives of the United States, who have preferred this country to the neighbouring republic. In a state of Society thus constituted, to excite national feelings and prejudices, is to convert this fine country into a second Ireland—into a very Bedlam. The use of the word *British* in a local and restricted sense as applying almost exclusively to natives of Great Britain, is as untrue and as anti-patriotic as it is unchristian to attempt to excite the sectional feelings which such an illegitimate use of the term is intended and calculated to create. Can any Christian English settler in this Province be a party to or countenance the inculcation of a feeling which

will brand his own Canadian born children? Is not a person born in Canada as much a British born subject as a person born in any other part of the British Empire? And is not a Conference of British subjects assembled in Canada as much a British Conference as one assembled in England? From whatever part of Great Britain or Ireland a man may emigrate, when he settles in Canada, are not all his interests Canadian? Is it not in Canada, then, that his all becomes invested and involved? And is it in Canada or in Hatton-Garden that his interests are likely to be most deeply felt and best consulted? It is a matter of thankfulness to know that the great majority of the old country members of this Conference, and the old country members of our Church generally, judge and feel as rational men and as Christians on this subject. CANADA is their HOME, in whatever part of the world they may have been born; and any attempt to excite feelings from the *place of their birth* against those who have been born in the *place of their adopted residence*, is unpatriotic, unchristian, and unnatural. In a country populated as this is, we should not know each other as Englishmen, or Irishmen, or Scotchmen, or Canadians, but as British provincial subjects,—as christians, and as brethren—having a common home, a common interest, and a common salvation.

Another remark has reference to the means which have been and are employed to induce Preachers to secede from this connexion. When one is told that he shall have a *cabin* instead of a *deck* passage; another that his family are respectable, and ought to be respectably supported; a third that certain debts should be paid for him, and he shall be well supported; a fourth that he shall receive his *full* pay as a superannuated Preacher, and so on—it is perfectly clear that, although no man leaving us may be influenced by worldly considerations, yet those considerations are on the side of his choice, and are employed to influence that choice in regard to others, if not in respect to himself. And such inducements are never resorted to, except in the conscious absence of sufficient *moral* and *religious* considerations—the only considerations on which we rest our cause, and which can influence the views and feelings of both our Preachers and people. Attempts at worldly proselytism, either amongst ministers or private members, are unworthy of any Christian cause; and the employment of Missionary Funds,—obtained in a considerable degree from the hard earnings of labouring people in England—to divide neighbourhoods, brethren, and families, instead of converting the heathen and sending the gospel to the destitute, forms a new era in the history of Christian enterprise, and cannot but excite shame and horror in every mind not blinded by prejudice or steeped in the feelings of party.

My last remark relates to our position as a Conference and as a Church. We have surveyed every inch of the ground on which we stand: We have offered to concede every thing but what appertains to our character, and to our existence and operations as a Wesleyan Methodist Church. The ground we occupy is Methodistic, is rational, is just. The very declarations of those who leave us attest this. They are compelled to pay homage to your character as a body; they cannot impeach your doctrines, or discipline, or practice; nor can they sustain a single objection against your principles or standing; the very reasons they assign for their own secession are variable, indefinite, personal or trivial. But the reasons which may be assigned for our position and unity, are tangible, are definite, are Methodistic, are satisfactory, are unanswerable. The preachers who remain with the Church and with the country cannot be influenced to do so by advantageous offers, by prospects of greater ease or emoluments; but only by the force of principle, by the love of justice, and the hopes of usefulness. Standing upon such ground, under the influence of such considerations, and relying upon the help and blessing of God the Spirit, I doubt not we shall be supplied with all things needful by a people to whose interests we devote ourselves, and on whose liberality we rely in preference to the sacrifice of their rights and our own principles, and will experience in the progress of our labours, however trying and afflicting for the present, that **“Greater is he that is among us than he that is in the world.”**

