woman suffrage in New Zealand during the last four years:

"I was rather surprised," he said, "just after I had entered a British country at Niagara to see a statement in a Toronto paper to the effect that woman suffrage in New Zealand had been disappointing because it had not conquered partyism, promoted social reform or pure administration. The facts are all against that article. In the first place, woman suffrage was introduced in 1893, not 1894. Mr. Ballance, the then premier, had given his pledge to bring in a bill conferring the franchise on women, and although personally opposed to it, I felt bound, on succeeding him, to carry out his pledge. The result has been such as to change my views on the question. I feared that to give women the right to vote would take them away from home life in a measure, unsex them and bring them down from the place they ought to have in the heart and home. Now, what has happened? The women of New Zealand, whose drawing-rooms were before that time like drawing-rooms all over the world, places where characters were talked of and dresses criticised, where there was much small talk that did not mean anything or perform any helpful function, are becoming less frivolous and very much more interested in questions of great social import, and especially those involving parliamentary action. Our women voters set a high standard. They demand representatives of clean moral life; and if there is ground to believe that a candidate is not of that sort, well, there is an end of him. And they are not contented merely with good morals, they pick on good representatives almost instinctively. They are just as eager to get good members of the House as good husbands. There are, of course, no women members, nor do the women desire that there should be. After four years' experience of woman suffrage, I have decided that it was not a mistake to grant it, and I should certainly say 'Yes' to a question as to whether Canada should go and do likewise."

The Great Wheel.

The practical wisdom of John Wesley in organizing the Methodist itinerancy has been amply vindicated by the logic of events. Indeed, every great religious movement has had an itinerant ministry. Our Lord and His apostles traversed the hill country and valleys of Judea, and Samaria, Galilee, and Perea from end to end. The missionary apostles went everywhere preaching the Word, confirming the churches, and planting new ones. The preaching friars in Wycliff's days, those "Reformers before the Reformation," planted the seeds of that sturdy Protestantism that has made England what it is. The friars white and friars grey of the continent, the Franciscans and Dominicans, the Canissards of France, the Covenanters of Scotland, were all itinerant preachers.

Methodism in this respect is but a revival of an ancient order tried and proved by time. But no such conspicuous phenomenon as the growth of Methodism has ever shown its success. Little more than one hundred and fifty years old its "line is gone out through all the earth, and its words to the ends of the world." The youngest of all the Churches of Christendom, it is the largest of the Protestant Churches of Christendom. Not less than five-and-twenty millions throughout the world enroll themselves under its banners.

It is said to be a fact that one-third of the Congregational churches in New England are without pastors, and one-third of the pastors are without churches. Yet no efficient means is in existence for bringing them together. There is a ministerial bureau in Boston, and a Presbyterian agency in Philadelphia, but these are confined to a small area and do not meet the needs of the Church at large. A writer in the New York *Observer*, a leading organ of the Presbyterian Church, boldly proposes that that Church shall adopt the essential features of the Methodist itinerancy. He writes as follows:

"The present system practically rules out every minister from the pastorate who is over fifty or fifty-five years of age. Congregations are unwilling to call a preacher who is up in years because they dislike to freeze him out in his old age, and there is no other way of getting rid of him. The old preachers would be more popular with the congregations than the young preachers, and they would always secure a good place if it were not for the unwise system of which they are the victims and to which they cling with such tenacity.

"An occasional change of the pastor lends wonderful life to the work of the church. No argument is called for on this point. Actual experience has placed it beyond the domain of argument. Our good preachers and successful pastors are needed so badly everywhere that we can hardly afford to let them stay in one place, even so long as one year. The eagle needs to stir up her nest. The idea of allowing one of our great preachers to spend all his life in one church is suicidal. Look at Dr. John Hall or Dr. B. M. Palmer, with his light hid under a bushel by the monopoly of a strong local church! Suppose either one of these men had spent two or three years in each one of a dozen different States. Such a course on the part of just these two men alone would have given us ten thousand more members than