

vated by the suffrages of the conference, and consequently subject to its decisions. In the first place, it prevents the appointment of any, except tried men. For the conference feels the responsibility and importance of the office, and, consequently, great care is taken in the selection of a man to fill the position. Again, the man who is thus elevated to the office of a bishop, will make it his study to qualify himself for the discharge of his duty. Every year adds, both to his experience and knowledge, thus increasing his capacity for the office. It is in this way that statesmen gain their ability, wisely to legislate and to govern; and it is the only means of combining practical wisdom in the administrations of the church. Still another objection is raised against Methodist Bishops, because they decide law points. And we would enquire, who are better qualified to decide them. They have made the Discipline their constant study—have had opportunity of conversing with the wisest and best of men on the various points of the same, and are less liable to be influenced by sectional feelings, or petty interests, than any other officer of the church. Would you vest the power in an Annual Conference?—Would they be likely to decide such questions more correctly than a bishop? On intricate law points not one-half of the men, who compose such conference, would be able to give you an answer at all, and still, without a personal knowledge of the law, they become its expounders. Again, this plan subjects us to a variety of decisions on the same point, as it may come up on different occasions. But with the bishops, these decisions are necessarily uniform, and if any member of an Annual Conference feels himself aggrieved by such decision, he has a right to an appeal to the General Conference, where the case may be argued at length, and the combined wisdom of that body brought to bear in a decision. For our own part, as an individual, we can see nothing dangerous in