

The harvester gets the credit; and the more if his sheaves are the stronger for the thorough grounding in doctrine the seed obtained 'neath the convincing logic of a thoughtful forerunner.

I am not counting without my host in this, as I can point out certain members of our own ministry who rarely enjoy the sight of conversion, but whose ministry is invariably followed by extensive ingatherings during the incumbency of their successors. And I believe that the sheaves expected by some will be borne by others in the day of harvest, to the surprise of many who are ready to denounce the ministry wherein but few accessions to the Church occur.

Yet after all this parenthetical reference, there is still reason for complaint over the meagre returns made from year to year, in the "*numbering up the people.*" And there is no doubt but the effect of a gospel ministry is painfully inferior to what the wants of a world and the evident designs of the Head of the Church demand.

Confining our treatment of this question to the Methodist Church, how reasonable the question, "Why so little success with a ministerial power which is supplemented by the valuable element of a lay ministry, and a variety of subordinate officers which open up channels of usefulness?" For there is nothing more sure than that the success of a ministry is dependent upon the provision made to intact the good effected by its effort; and in no Church is this more amply provided for than in the Church referred to, wherein by a local ministry the services are more common, and by the leaders the membership, in Mr. Guthrie's words, "*are held fast.*"

But I fancy I hear the reader say, "Is not the ministry itself somewhat to blame in this matter?" It may be so. And if so, there is no disposition in the writer to burke the question. Indeed, there is some reason to fear that to the pulpit belongs a measure of blame. It would be strange indeed if, among a ministry as large as in the Canadian Wesleyan Church, there was not a measure of defect. And it would be equally strange if the defect were perfectly concealed. And it is but the credit due to the faithful in this inquiry to be plain in dealing with those in whom correction is necessary. For instance, if the minister evinces by his influence the suspicion at least that there is a want of conformity between himself and his office, it does but defend the man whose influence declares him to be within his calling, if the pen or the tongue deals faithfully with the man suspected as out of place. And who, witnessing an incongruity in the ministerial office, is not liable to suspect either that the man has broken the trust confided in him by the Spirit that called him, or was never called at all by that Spirit? And if in the pulpit, without divine sanction, there is some blame at least at the door of the Church itself, inasmuch as Methodism has ample means for proving its ministry before it is entrusted with the functions of ordination.

But it may be said that, whether called or not to the holy office, there are some who seem at least to limit the aim of the pulpit to the mere intellectual idea of preaching—satisfied when a sermon carefully prepared is delivered to a delighted crowd powerless to criticise its rhetoric, logic, poetry, or theology.