oint." Our let the laity e pastorate ve cause to time being the Church. rs of these ir powers in that those laity of the -the doing ver-topping e moment. ny enacted ministers I ole society ir, and no appoint the l let these, dents, and inted, conrepresent would be

COUNT.

iority, and

nairmen of airman to own will. 1 done by ot prevent eir nature) levellers. t on both and put it practically dours are man of a refuse to rights of which the ian refuse nd unity, parely out ential, he

> ethodism roduction erely, but

THE EPISCOPAL OFFICE.

First, then, as to the Episcopal office itself: The change in the original Canada Conference from a permanent Episcopacy to that of an annual Presidency arose from no dissatisfaction with the Episcopacy, but on the principle of compromise for peace sake, the same which is now being urged. All that remain of the ministers and members who were connected with the Church before 1832, have no prejudice, but pleasant memories of that form of Methodism. It is true, there is a large infusion in the present "Methodist Church of Canada" who either came from non-Episcopal Methodist bodies in England since 1832, or were brought into the Church during this period, and all of those bodies of that type in this country, contracting parties to the Union, can not be expected to have any proclivities for Episcopacy, and may even have prejudices against it, whose preferences will require concession. Besides, the views of the Eastern Conferences deserve to be considered, which have not been trained in notions at all leading to Episcopacy. Yet even these, I would venture to say, if they went to reside in the neighboring republic, would feel no scruples in uniting with the prominent Methodist body in that country because of its Episcopacy.

GENERAL SUPERINTENDENTS.

But even supposing our Episcopal friends will have to surrender something for union in that particular, the essentials of Episcopacy may be preserved and a real element of good secured. The very short experiment in the newly-united body of a President of General Conference, without any general supervision of an authoritative kind, should have convinced us that the contrivance is an anomily and an instance of connexional weakness and incompleteness. A General Superintendency, presiding in the Annual Conferences, would give a homogeneity, a unity, and an energy to the united body, which we need not expect to have in our present disjointed mode of operation. But the General Superintendency may be secured without the form of a separate ordination, or a life-long incumbency of office. An election from General Conference to General Conference, or for the space of four years, provided successful administrators were eligible to reelection, would secure all the benefits of oversight, without the danger of confounding an office with an order. You could keep the efficient, or get rid of the inefficient, which you cannot do with a life-long Episcopacy. If our Episcopal brethren will yield the consecration, which is absurd in a mere presbyterial overseer, we shall be able, I hope, to secure the General Superintendency in the united body.

A MODIFIED PRESIDING ELDERSHIP.

If we have travelling General Overseers, we may get rid of the expense of Presiding Elders, or travelling Chairmen—unless in the case of missionary ground, where I would have the Annual Conferences empowered to relieve the chairmen of districts from the care of particular charges, and to instruct them to travel constantly throughout their respective districts; in which case, they might be called Presiding Elders,—indeed, in either case, in my humble opinion, it is a more expressive name than chairman.