ground in the prosecutions of missionary openings, as Church government is a secondary matter in Methodism, it has been thought best that these two branches should combine for the evangelization of the country, each one giving up some peculiarity, adopting some feature of administrative economy from the other, all of which changes were made constitutionally. Was it kind and Christian-like in a very small minority to try to force their views on the majority? or to rend the peace and unity of an otherwise prosperous Church because their views could not be met? Did they not justly lay themselves open to the suspicion that their opposition was founded in one or more of the following causes—one or two in some, and all in others—namely, prejudice, bigotry, vanity, ambition, want of humility, and love of ascendency and notoriety? If I am forced at last to speak out, I must say I have never changed the opinion I had then, that their stand was unwarranted and wicked—oh, it was enough to make angels weep to witness the strife and evil-speaking which were resorted to to rend happy societies apart.

The manner of prosecuting these devisive objects, and the reasons for their success, are honestly put, and expressed in the most temperate language and kindest spirit in my biographical history, which I here reproduce, as I choose to treat this matter in the judicial, rather than in the controversial, manner :—" At first their accessions were mostly from the old body, for a disruptive spirit is not usually the spirit of revival. They drew on the Wesleyan Church in various ways and for many years. First, there were the disaffected local preachers and their immediate friends. . . . . These local preachers showed the most untiring industry. They visited nearly every local preacher in the land, and tried to shake his adherence to the Conference. Wherever they heard of a dissatisfied or susceptible class-leader, they