

English Conference in 1833 ; but, when the act of separation was ratified by the constitutional authority of the Conference, the opponents of the measure, like loyal Methodists, acquiesced in the arrangement, believing that it was the part of true Christians to waive personal preferences in things non-essential, rather than endanger the peace of the Church by fighting for a mere matter of opinion.

Observe, now, the glaring inconsistency of those who pretend that the union was unconstitutional because it was not submitted to the people. Their *theory* has always been the government of majorities ; in civil affairs the majority of the people ; in ecclesiastical affairs the majority of the Church. Their *practice*, in the latter particular, has been just the reverse. When the Rules respecting Local Preachers were submitted to the whole church in 1834, and had been ratified by more than three-fourths of the Quarterly Official Meetings of the Connexion, these same persons, who contended so loudly for the government of majorities, *refused to abide by the verdict*, and soon after withdrew from the Church ! And in all the history of the present M. E. Church in Canada, I am not aware of a single instance in which any important act of its General Conference has been submitted to the people for ratification. If I am mistaken on this point, I am open to correction : at present, I am not aware of any such instance. Assuredly, when steps were taken last year to effect a union with the M. E. Church in the United States, the people were not consulted in the matter.

Again, it has been said that the preachers attempted to do away with the General Conference ; and the inference seems to be, that therefore the whole arrangement was illegal. But be it observed, only the preachers—*i.e.*, the Conference—had *power* to do this. The General Conference was not established by the laity, nor was any right or privilege of the laity involved in its continued existence. A General Conference is not now—nor ever has been—considered an essential principle of Methodist economy. Where it exists, it is merely a prudential regulation, liable to be changed at any time by the same authority that established it.

In regard to the second supposition,—that the Conference had no *moral* right to consummate the union, because the majority of the people were opposed,—I need only say, that while the Preachers, on the final vote, were entirely unanimous, the people were very nearly so. The proof of this is to be found in the fact, that after several years of fierce agitation, by a few individuals, during which every form of misrepresentation and appeal that could mislead the ignorant or inflame the disaffected and ambitious, (and these are to be found in every church,) was freely used, only a few hundred members, out of over fifteen thousand, could be persuaded to withdraw. Where is the church to-day from which a larger number could not be drawn by years of agitation, provided men could be found weak enough—or wicked enough—to lead so unholy a crusade ? “ Suppose,” says a minister of the M. E. Church, in a late article upon this controversy, “ the English (Episcopalian) Church of this country should abolish Episcopacy, renounce its orders, revolutionize its entire economy, . . . what would be the result ? . . .