

in our mission work—our good brother can see little but retrogression and indifference since the union; and deems it a proof that our present Church organization is defective, because for the last few years we have not opened new missions in heathen lands. Our Church is unfavourably compared with the M. E. Church. Yet it is only a few years ago since Mr. Macdonald, at the General Conference of the M. E. Church, at Baltimore, U. S., compared the superior liberality of our Canadian Methodists in their gifts to missions, with that of U. S. Methodism, in a way that stirred up our friends in the United States to increased liberality. How then can the larger mission work of the larger Church condemn our work? If we have not in recent years opened new missions, surely this has not arisen from anything in our organization which prevented it. We have the same agencies for the work we have always had. The only difference between our present Missionary Board and the Missionary Committee before the union, is that the present arrangement places the power of inaugurating action in fewer hands, and is in fact less democratic than the old committee. It is somewhat suggestive that this greater concentration of power, should lead to a demand from some of the leading members of the present Missionary Board, in favour of placing still greater executive power in the hands of the few. With what I must regard as singular inconsistency, while it is alleged that we have among us a supply of men of ample ability and piety for bishops, to whom the greatest responsibility may be safely committed, our present Missionary Board is disparaged, as if it was unworthy to be compared with the English Wesleyan Missionary Committee. What the ground of this disparagement I know not.

I agree with all that is said about the providential character of the opening in Japan, and the gratifying success of our missionaries there; but is it quite fair to the great majority of our ministers and people to represent them as without sympathy for that part of our work? Let any who have been against the Japan Mission bear the blame of their opposition; but let us give due credit to those who have spoken, and written, and liberally contributed in behalf of that work. Is there any good ground for the allegation, that because the British Columbia and Japan Missions were commenced before the union, the form of our Church organization at that time had anything to do with the