

full of the Holy Ghost and wisdom, whom *we may appoint*." Our Discipline should first fix the standard of qualification, then let the laity choose men corresponding with this description, and let the pastorate have the right of finally authorizing, or vetoing, if they have cause to believe an individual unworthy; but, of course, at the same time being responsible as they are in all other respects to the judiciary of the Church.

I hold some peculiar opinions myself about the powers of these local or circuit courts, and the way they have exercised their powers in times past. Let the stickler for lay-suffrage remember that those quarterly meeting elections are no election by the general laity of the Church, but is the election of lay-officials of one another—the doing of a close corporation, answerable to no one, but often over-topping the ministry and rank and file of the Church at the same moment. Talk of priestly tyranny; I have seen more intolerable tyranny enacted by a few local courts that I could particularize than all the ministers I ever knew. I believe the true analogy would be, let the whole society elect the Stewards who handle their money once a year, and no Society "Representatives" would be needed; let the pastor appoint the Leaders, with the concurrence of their several classes; and let these, with the local preachers, exhorters, S. School Superintendents, and Representatives of Trustee Boards, as at the present appointed, constitute the Quarterly Official Meeting. The Stewards would represent the financial interests of the membership, and the Leaders would be at once the sharers of the ministers' pastoral work and authority, and yet the representatives of their several classes as well.

METHOD FOR CALLING AN ARBITRARY CHAIRMAN TO ACCOUNT.

I think that what the demanders for electing the chairmen of Church-meetings seek to prevent is the right of a clerical chairman to refuse putting a vote, or his adjourning a meeting at his own will. There is no doubt that some tyrannical things have been done by arbitrary men, (and all the enactments in the world will not prevent some men being arbitrary when they get into office—it is their nature) especially when goaded on by dangerous and turbulent levellers. These two extremes create all the trouble; but their conduct on both sides works the cure of the mischief: people get weary of it and put it down. Now this power of a chairman complained of is practically possessed by the chairmen of all bodies; but both theirs and ours are amenable for their acts, and they ought to be. If a chairman of a meeting sees that a resolution is unconstitutional, he should refuse to put it; but if his ruling is reported to be in conflict with the rights of the laity, there should be a court for trying the question, in which the laity should compose a moiety of the members. If a chairman refuse to put a motion which conflicts with connexional authority and unity, he deserves respect and commendation; but if he does it barely out of stupid adherence to his own preferences in matters unessential, he deserves to be arraigned and deprived of his office.

CONCESSIONS TO THE EPISCOPALS.

The preferences and wishes of the Episcopal type of Methodism deserve to be considered in a plan for unification, and the introduction of some of its characteristics would be not a concession merely, but real elements of strength, energy, and usefulness.

origi
an a
pacy
whic
men
preju
true,
Cana
Engl
peric
parti
Epis
ence:
Conf
notio
to sa
feel r
count

I
some
may
short
Conf
shoul
instan
Super
homo
need
But th
a sepa
from
four
electio
of cor
or get
Episco
which
hope,

If
expens
case o
ences
particu
out th
Presid
a more