

I answer fearlessly that, under similar circumstances, the result would be precisely the same as in the Methodist body in 1833." Probably it would: in other words, although the changes might be adopted unanimously by the Synod, and approved by more than fifteen-sixteenths of the people, a few ambitious and dissatisfied men would be found to head a faction and reorganize on the old plan!

Let it be noted that we are not now considering whether or not the union was a wise measure; but, simply whether the Conference had the legal and moral right to act as it did. That it had the legal right is plain upon the very face of the Discipline; that it had the moral right is plain from the facts that no principle of Methodism or Christianity was sacrificed, and that the Church, as a whole, was heartily in favor of the measure. This thing was not done hurriedly, nor yet in a corner. The basis of union was agreed to in 1832, and published throughout the Connexion; efforts were made to ascertain the views of the people, and so unanimous were they, that up to the time when the Union was consummated in 1833, no petition or remonstrance emanated from the Societies. As already intimated, the opposition was by Local Preachers, and a few others whom they were able to influence. To show that I am not misrepresenting the fact, I append an extract from a pamphlet published by the Rev. Thomas Webster, a prominent minister of the M. E. Church, and the bitterest assailant of the Union: additional evidence, if necessary, will be adduced in the proper place. Speaking of the opposition to the Union, Mr. Webster says:—(The italics are mine).

"As soon as it was announced in the *Guardian* that a union between the English and Canadian Conferences was contemplated, the *Local Preachers took the alarm*, and in their Conference, assembled in the Trafalgar Meeting House, July 6th, 1832, the following resolution was adopted:—'*Resolved*—That, as it appears from the *Christian Guardian* that an union between the Missionaries from Britain and our Church is contemplated, we address our Annual Conference on the subject of *our privileges as Local Preachers*—and that Bros. Picket, Culp, and Brown, be the Committee to draft such address, and forward it for presentation.'"

The ground now taken by the M. E. Church—that the Union was against the wishes of the people—is utterly without foundation. The great body of the laity heartily favored the movement, and hence those who refused to abide by the new arrangement practically took the ground—which they seem to have held ever since—that the vast majority of preachers and people who approved of the union ought to have submitted to the dictation of the dozen or so of Local Preachers who opposed it.

(To be continued.)

---

OVER THE RIVER.—God sometimes tries the faith, and calls forth the prayer of His people, by placing a blessing at a distance from them. They perceive it is near but cannot reach it,—as it were, on the other side of the river. By prayer we must cross the stream and fetch it.