

the election of officers, &c. Consequently, a general meeting of the Society ought to have had a Provincial character,—it ought to have been held at Toronto, the seat of the Executive of Methodist Government, and the Committee should have included active and influential persons, friends of the cause in every part of the Province. It appears that it is not necessary to have such a meeting; the preachers who manage the funds can do all the business. On this occasion, a preacher was in the chair, the resolutions were moved and seconded by preachers, and a majority of preachers constituted the Committee, and as to the laymen added to it, not one was of St. Catharines, where the meeting was held, but all of Toronto, not one of whom was then present. We do not say that preachers, as subscribers, have not the same privilege as other subscribers, but that there is no real society in existence if the affairs are managed by them entirely. These remarks are only intended to show the assumption of the entire control of the mission funds by the Preachers. We dare say that those laymen who have been added to the Committee, without consulting them, will never be further consulted, or know anything more of the management of the funds, than if their names were not on the list of the Committee. Of this Committee, some are persons of very recent connection with the Church, and some have not even the qualification for voting, not contributing £1 per annum to the funds of the Society. The principle on which the selections have been made, we shall notice on some other occasion.

Methodism generally does more for the Methodists, than the Methodists do for Methodism."

We take the above extract from the *Christian Guardian*, of the 30th instant. On the occasion on which that sentiment was expressed, the editor of the *Guardian* was giving a statement of the number of collections made in the Methodist Connection, by the preachers in England. That subject we have no occasion, at present, to notice; but the last sentence,—that which we have extracted,—is one from which we dissent strongly, whether it is intended to apply it to the Methodists of Canada or England. Let us ask what the Methodists in England do for Methodism? They pay all the demands upon them, specified in the *Guardian*,—maintain all their funds, and give £100,000 per annum for the support of missions throughout the world.

What do the Methodists of Canada do for Methodism? The answer is a short one, they maintain it; and, in addition, contribute £2000 per annum for missions. A few years ago, they raised, on an emergency, £4000 for Victoria College, and since that, nearly the same sum, in commemoration of the centenary of Methodism; all this in addition to supporting their ordinary funds. We can answer for them that they always will do so, if properly treated. What can the *Guardian* want more than maintenance for the funds of Methodism, and has he not got that? People are not made liberal by complaining of them. Have not all the preachers the necessities and comforts of life, and some even its luxuries? What, then, does he want? Certainly it seems ungracious to tell the public that the Methodists do not do enough; it is not the best way to en-

courage them to do more. Having shown that the Methodists do for Methodism all that is required, we come to the next question,—what has Methodism done for them? It is a strange idea to separate the Methodists from Methodism as the editor of the *Guardian* herein does,—to separate the abstract term from its substantial representative. We have always thought that as Methodism was the system, Methodists were the very life of it; but, according to the *Guardian*, Methodism is something distinct and separable,—something that does more for the Methodists than they do for it. If the *Guardian* means, by the word Methodism, the Preachers; if that interpretation were true, there is a want of delicacy in making the complaint; for, surely, the *Guardian* does not mean to say that the Preachers do more for the Methodists than the Methodists do for them. When they reflect a little, and recognize their present station in Society, we think this assertion cannot be made good. If the *Guardian* means Methodist Institutions, by the word Methodism, we think that those who so love them as to be induced to sustain them are not on the debtor side of the account. We must now come to the other side of the question,—Regarding the word Methodism to imply, jointly, Methodist Institutions and the agency of management,—the Preachers. We have to answer the question, what has Methodism, as a system, done for the Methodists in Canada? We might add, for the inhabitants generally? There are about 140 preachers who have the machinery of Methodism, in order to contribute towards the evangelization of Canada,—a machinery undoubtedly efficient and well adapted for the purpose, as proved by unvarying success in every part of the world where it has been in operation. Let us see what they have done, bearing in mind that they have the gratuitous assistance of, perhaps, 300 local preachers, and about 1000 leaders. In 1833, they had 16,000 members; in 1845, 23,000. In another part of this number we have shown the rate of increase for the last thirteen years. If about 1450 clerical and lay agents were instrumental in adding one each to the church every year, the number of members would now be 35,000 instead of its present number 23,000. We say, then, that in proportion to the instrumentality employed, and to the expense of maintaining that instrumentality, Methodism in Canada has done next to nothing. About 50,000 sermons and exhortations are delivered in a year in the Methodist Church, besides those at protracted and camp meetings; there are also prayer meetings in great numbers. This increase of 7000, or about 540 members per annum requires about 1000 sermons to add a member to the Church. This differs a little from the Apostle Peter's one sermon, which added about 3000 to the Primitive Church. We trust the reader will enter into these calculations, and have no doubt he will agree with us that adding to the Wesleyan Methodist Church is a work of difficulty unusual to Christianity, and that it proves, to a great extent, the absence of divine co-operation and blessing.

But we have another argument on this subject, the Methodist Institutions are operating upon a population increasing by other means than the ordinary mode of increase. We allude to the increase by immigration. This we have explain-

ed in another part of our present number. Now, the Wesleyan Methodist Church has gathered in none of these immigrants, or, it has gathered in the most of its increase by that means. If it gathered in none of them, how can it be accounted for that thousands of them were Methodists in the Old Country, and did not join the Wesleyan Methodist Church here. And, if it gathered in most or all of these that came by immigration, where is the increase from the original stock of 16,000. If 7000 are added by immigration, there is no increase whatever by the labours of the preachers. If put only are added by immigration, then the increase is too inconsiderable to be worthy of notice.

There is also an argument on the question, of a moral character, what has Methodism done for its own people? Has it made them all eminent for holiness of heart and life?—Has it presented to the world an eminently holy people?—Are all the Churches at peace, and edified? Can it be said that great grace is upon them all,—that they are walking in the comforts of the Holy Ghost, and are multiplied? It is too well known that this is not the state of the Church; a decrease of 803 this year contradicts the whole. The Church is in a deplorable state, owing to political meddling of the Conference with the affairs of the Province. It has been said that the decrease of 803 has been the consequence of a more rigid application of the discipline. If this is true, what an admission! that the preachers so neglected the discipline as to retain 803 unworthy members. But this is not the truth; the discipline has not been so honored; for we could point out so many that would not have been passed over, if that had been the case. Did these 803 suddenly fall from their steadfastness, or have they gradually amounted to this number, by years of a laxity of discipline? In either case, the Ministry are equally to blame; there is some serious defect of some kind in relation to this question.

THE CENTENARY FUND.

In our number for May, we gave a statement, made out as fully and correctly as was in our power, of the state of the Centenary Fund. We pointed out as a fact, that either the amount contributed was loaned out at three per cent, or that the whole amount received had not been acknowledged. If the managers of that fund wished to deserve the confidence of the members of the church, they were bound to publish a full explanation of the state of the Centenary Fund. Our case is clearly proved, for they acknowledge to have received up to June 1842, £3,266. Any one will see that the Interest for that sum is nearly the amount acknowledged to have been received as interest of that fund at three per cent; that amount acknowledged is £111 15s. 9d., and that is the interest of £3,742 at 3 per cent.

It was also stated that the subscriptions amounted to about £10,000. Now, we find no acknowledgment of any receipts since June 1842; and if such have been acknowledged, and we have overlooked them, where is the additional interest? Nor have we any further explanation till the appearance of the Minutes of Conference for 1845.

We then find that the interest of the Centenary Fund is £87 16s. 3½d; this reduces the principle to about £2,929,