

from either the class Society, the local Society, or the circuit Society, each, and all of which he is a member.

We are bound in all our proceedings to recognize the confessional principle or *oneness* of Wesleyan Methodism. Our Societies are not separate and detached parts, they are a *unity*. The only separation or division we recognize is local, or from necessity and expediency; nor are these lines so well drawn and so well defined as not liable to be changed from year to year, without in the least affecting our position in the Church. The class that forms a part of a Circuit now, may be embraced in a Circuit of a different size and name next year. The Circuit is merely an organization for the more effectually performing the duties enjoined by our Discipline, and nothing short of it can do so; nothing beyond it is necessary. The distinctiveness on a Circuit is merely local and prudential, all cannot live in the same village, all cannot meet in the same class, but all are subject to the same laws,—responsible to the same order of trial, and are under one supervision. To have all cases tried by local committees, would soon destroy unity in the administration of Discipline, a crime in one place might be deemed a slight offence in another place. The Society in one part of a Circuit might withdraw in disgust from a Church, where crime may be tolerated, or venial offending may, through prejudice, be punished as capital.

There are other strong reasons why the rule should be interpreted as above, as when a dispute occurs between brethren, or when a member is charged with crime, opinions are likely to be hastily formed, and with much warmth and little judgment. It is so, whether the Society be one class or many. Now, in the administration of civil law, an interested juror, or one who has expressed an opinion in reference to a case at issue, may be objected to and set aside; and sometimes owing to strong prejudices, the *venue* is removed from one county to another; and, certainly, our judicial proceedings should also be above all suspicion, and every possible means should be adopted to secure a fair and impartial investigation.

For many years in this Province, and in some settlements still, the whole Society of some appointments has been one class, and that not a very large one, often composed of the members of two or three families. We know of a class of twenty-five members, and all, with the exception of four, bear the same name, and are connected by close ties of consanguinity. Would it be just or proper in case of a dispute, or of crime, to arraign the accused before such a Society, or a select number of them? Is it desirable to embroil a few families in further animosity and dispute, by placing any of them in a position to incur the almost inevitable censures arising out of these painful investigations?

H.