

THE WESLEYAN
FRIDAY, OCTOBER 13, 1882.

A CASE OF OVERDOING.

Nearly enough has been said on "Marmion." Thanks to the Ontario Minister of Education, and Archbishop Lynch, and half the papers in the Dominion, this poem of Walter Scott will be read by thousands who never read it before. The other day, on a railway train, we saw a gentleman renewing his acquaintance with it, and showing its finer passages to several friends. The wisdom of Mr. Crooks in placing it in the list of authorized educational books may be questioned, in view of the supersensitive disposition of Roman Catholics, but, from a Romanist point of view, Archbishop Lynch has shown a sad lack of his usual keenness. Had the Minister of Education, and the Archbishop quietly agreed to allow it to run for a year, then to be withdrawn, the former would have better preserved his dignity and the latter have best served his church. The sad story of the convent, of broken vows, of rivalry in love, and of burial alive in the wall of the convent, will be read by a much greater number than would otherwise have looked at it. Above all is the fact that the fearful world, painting is justified by pages of history which cannot be torn out.

Our Roman Catholic friends would act with much greater wisdom in acknowledging the evil of the past. In the endeavour to hide its wrongs they make themselves partakers of the evil: in the attempt to suppress truth they only publish more widely the terrible deeds of a past age. A contemporary very properly speaks of Archbishop Lynch's course as a "remarkable instance of unwilling and unconscious homage to the spirit of the age, when the hours of a system that justifies its past record strain every nerve, try every art, to make that past appear to be in accord with the present." It is but too evident that Rome is in accordance with the spirit of the age only in appearance—not in fact.

EGYPT'S FUTURE.

Sir Garnet Wolseley's short, sharp campaign has disposed of the Egyptian leader with almost magical haste: there yet remains to the Cabinet the more difficult task—the restoration of order and the reorganization of the country. The very promptness with which the task of the soldier has been performed places almost prematurely before the statesman the problem which now he must solve.

There can be no doubt that the Khedive and his ministers will again be placed in the foreground, but it is impossible that the former state of things can be resumed. The cost incurred in the recent war, and the risk involved in lighting a torch which might have set the world in a blaze, has been too serious to permit any arrangement which may furnish an opportunity for an early repetition. England's own interests in the East, and it is keenly fixed upon her action, should prompt her Christian men and women to pray that their leaders may be guided to a wise solution of their difficult problem. More than once Egypt has been a pivot on which many of the world's great movements have turned; at this moment history may repeat itself, and centuries from the pyramids may look down upon the results of the decisions of the Gladstone cabinet. "It does not much matter," says an English paper, "what name is bestowed upon our action, or how it is described. We need not annex or protest, but we must see that an efficient Government is set up and kept up in Egypt. We must take care that the country is protected against foes from without and intrigues within. We must maintain order, repress violence, dispense equal justice, collect the revenue by scientific methods, develop the resources of the country, promote the education of the people, and, in short do for Egypt what we are doing for India. The process may be called by any name that strikes the fancy of our rulers. All that the country demands is that the things we have mentioned shall be done under some name, and done effectually."

The next regular meeting of the General Conference of the Methodist Church of Canada will be held at the Metropolitan Church, Toronto. Should an adjourned meeting of the late Conference be deemed necessary, it will be held at Belleville, Ont.

We have just been reading the "last words" of the New York Methodist. The concluding editorial says:—"It is not considered good manners for a bride to say how many offers she has 'declined with thanks and hearty appreciation of honor,' but she will state that she has always felt that if she did marry, she could wed no one but her cousin, *The Christian Advocate*." That union has at length been consummated, with the hearty approval of proprietors and editor. Only the high regard entertained by us for the *Christian Advocate* represses an expression of regret at an arrangement which robs us of such an excellent exchange. Dr. Wheeler, the late editor, was not transferred, but does not expect to disappear from journalism. *The Methodist* was founded in 1869, with George L. Seney as principal owner and stockholder. Oliver Hoyt was also interested in its management. The Rev. Dr. Crooks was its editor for fifteen years, associated with the Rev. Dr. Abel Stevens. From its inception the paper took a bold stand on the issue of slavery and maintained a vigorous attitude on the question of lay delegation. The fact that these issues have now no general interest and the publication was not remunerative led to the union with *The Christian Advocate*, whose circulation is thus increased from 53,000 copies weekly to about 65,000.

A neat and cheap little volume—the "Centenary of Methodism in Eastern British America—1782-1882" has just been laid on our table. In addition to the interest it must have for readers at the present, it will be prized as a repository of the able and eloquent addresses delivered at the recent Conference on the subject which has called it forth. Dr. Douglas's Centennial address, Mr. Lathern's Centennial Sermon, and Dr. Richey's letter, with the several speeches given at the time, are found here; the whole preceded by a preface from the pen of the Rev. Dr. McMurray. We recommend our ministers to order a copy at once. It will afford both inspiration and information for their Centennial addresses. It should also find a place in all Methodist homes. Christian devotion and denominational loyalty will at once be promoted by the perusal of it, and both qualifications, so indispensable to the success of Methodism at any period, do not over-abound in our churches. Dr. McMurray and Mr. Lathern, who have had the preparation of this little volume in charge, deserve the thanks of the Methodist public.

What Romanism would do if she were not tethered, is now and then shown with startling effect. A young Romanist of St. Louis was recently married to a Protestant lady, the ceremony having been performed at a Roman Catholic chapel in the morning and at a Presbyterian church in the evening. The following week the Roman Catholic organ of the diocese made a most scandalous attack upon the persons concerned. The young man is accused of committing a "mortal sin," of trampling on his religion, of spitting on the cross, selling his manhood, outraging the memory of his dead kinsmen, of selling "his soul and the souls of his unborn children to the devil on his wedding day." "Such a wedding," says the *Watchman*, "is a covenant with Hell and a league with the Devil." "And this," says a contemporary, "is not in Rome or South America, but in St. Louis, and in this nineteenth century. This shows the real temper of the unregenerate Irish Roman Catholic priest, and suggests what Romanism would do in this country if it had its own way."

Centennial sermons will be preached in the larger Methodist Churches in this city, on Sunday next. Rev. John Lathern, it will be seen by the plan, will preach morning and evening; if possible, Rev. Dr. Rice, President of the General Conference, will conduct the alternate services on that day. At Charles St. Church, the Rev. R. Brecken will repeat, according to request, the sermon preached last Sunday evening at Brunswick St. The pastor of Grafton St. Church, Rev. J. J. Teasdale, expects to reach home on Saturday evening. Centennial services will be held at Brunswick Street Church on Monday evening; at Grafton St. Church on Tuesday evening; at Charles St. Church on Wednesday evening; and at Dartmouth on Thursday evening.

It is said that in the early days of Arkansas settlers would confidentially ask a new comer, "What might your name be afore you came here?" It is to be feared that our people will soon ask a similar question of any man who may come to our Provinces in the role of evangelist, if more strict attention is not paid to our rules and more trustworthy credentials are not demanded. Both ministers and people must learn to act with inflexible firmness in the matter. The Baltimore correspondent of the N. Y. *Methodist*, we observe, complains that the cause of religion and our modes of revival work have been discredited by sad scandals connected with two young men widely known as "evangelists." One was an officer in the Salvation Army, named "Happy Charley," who used to be advertised in the papers as giving "Gospel Breakdowns," which consisted in singing religious ditties to the accompaniment of a banjo. The other case was that of a young man who held an exhorter's license from the "Seaman's Union Bethel." To know that others suffer is poor satisfaction, but it may serve to burn in some lessons we have learned.

In the programme of exercises for the Autumnal session of the Baptist Union of Great Britain and Ireland is a grand communion service to be held in Myrtle Street Chapel, Liverpool. We should like to be there. Will not Jesus be very near to his people as they unite in calling to mind his death and sacrifice in his own appointed way? And yet this very service is the one of the programme to which our neighbor, the *Visitor*, objects. It coolly says: "How our brethren can drag the Lord's Supper into general meetings and give their latitudinarian invitations to it, and justify it by New Testament precedent or teaching is more than we are able to fathom. Our brethren seem more desirous to ventilate a loose charity than to stand loyally for the faith and order once delivered to the saints." Our neighbor's teaching, not the proposed celebration of the Lord's Supper, is what we are unable to fathom! We say it in sorrow.

We notice that some American papers are proposing the appointment of Thanksgiving day earlier in the year. A "harvest home" after the English style might be substituted by us, but a general thanksgiving could scarcely be observed at an earlier date. Meanwhile rich causes for thankfulness are not wanting. The *London Times* sums up an exhaustive review of the annual summary of the harvests of the world issued at Marseilles: "Never during the time since these reports were collected have the harvests in the Northern Hemisphere been so good all round. We usually have had to report a deficiency either in Europe or America. This year there is absolutely none. The world has over an average harvest, and with such a harvest the year is likely to be one of cheap abundance."

The committee of the London Sunday-school Union has issued its annual call for the observance of Sunday and Monday, October 15 and 16, as days for universal prayer for Sunday-schools. The attention of the Methodist Sunday-schools of the United States has been called to this fact, but we have received no circular respecting the observance of the days named in this quarter. Those, however, who then may take the cause of Sunday-schools or the spiritual welfare of their classes to the mercy-seat will be certain to meet kindred spirits there.

The kind reception given by Halifax Methodists to the young men who recently arrived here to enter on circuit work in the Nova Scotia Conference gives us much satisfaction. Public opinion is greatly in their favor. We regret that in any quarter a word should have been penned to cause them a moment's uneasiness. They will only need a little while to learn that they and those who have invited them to cross the ocean are in thorough harmony. Only one is yet without appointment; several places would welcome him, but the authorities have not yet named his destination.

Any superintendents of circuits who have not received lists of subscribers to the *Wesleyan* since the last Conference are requested to notify the Book Steward to that effect.

GENERAL CONFERENCE.

METHODIST UNION.

Rev. Leroy Hooker was sorry to speak as he was compelled to. Our fathers must soon pass away, and then young men must face all the acts of the church. His heart was for union but he must speak against his heart. He was against union at this particular time. He thought they had better wait until they could do so without invading each other's territory. They had wasted the Lord's money. They had sent Methodist Episcopal, Primitive and Canada Methodists into the North West, and they had wasted the Lord's missionary money in fighting one another. He would keep the pastorate separate. He was not yet prepared to become the hired man of the laity, though he would do for them all that a minister of Christ could be expected to do. In respect to the General Superintendency he could not go in for it. On the ground of expense he opposed it, for it involved a great expense in committees in travelling from one point to another, and there was a proposed meeting of the General Conference which would involve an outlay of \$6,000.

Mr. Warring Kennedy said he was in favor of union. He would take his pencil and write "Union is strength," and underneath it, "It is good and pleasant for brethren to dwell together in unity." He was satisfied with the church government of the Methodist Church of Canada. He could not believe that if the others felt the same about their own churches that they would upset it all for the sake of union. There was the point of lay representation. For his part he did not believe that the laymen of this church wanted lay representation in the Annual Conference. He spoke of the surrenders which had already been made for the sake of union. He believed that the Primitive Methodist Church, the Bible Christian Church, and the Methodist Episcopal Church would be perfectly satisfied with the admission of laymen into the Annual Conference. He thought the latter would accept this without the general superintendency, as a change had been made at the last General Conference of their Church in this direction. It was this general superintendency that was a difficulty to him. He could accept the lay delegates to Annual Conferences, but he did not know enough of this general superintendency to accept it.

Mr. Wm. Watson said that there was not anything in the report of the Union Committee that he could not accept, though he did not believe that laymen desired to be on the Stationing Committee or in the Annual Conference. It had been said that they must make haste slowly, and when he read the limitation at the end of the report, he thought haste would be made slowly.

FOURTEENTH DAY, SEP. 23.

REPORT OF DISCIPLINE COMMITTEE.

On motion by Rev. R. Duncan, altering the wording of paragraph 142 in the discipline in order that inequality in the representation of the various sections might be regulated. Carried.

It appears that now all ministers in a circuit have a seat in the District meeting, and in cases where there was a college or a number of superannuated ministers that circuit, having also an equal number of laymen, was likely to have a preponderance in the districts.

On notice of motion by Rev. Dr. Pope, proposing to omit the words "in the ark of" from the baptismal service. No change recommended. Carried.

METHODIST UNION.

Rev. Dr. Williams said, I am asked to affirm the principle of lay representation in the Annual Conference. I will not affirm this principle for the reason that we have had no conversation about it. Before it was known what was the opinion of this General Conference it seems to me we were committed to lay representation and the general superintendency. We are now asked to consent to these two principles and send them to the lower court. I say if you are going in for lay representation let us know what are going to be the functions, powers, and the duties of these laymen.

Rev. L. N. Beaudry said that some had said they ought to pray over the matter. Had they not been praying for years that God would bring about so desirable a union as that they were contemplating to-day. It had been said on the Conference floor that the whole of the Protestant Church was looking down upon them and noting what their action would be; but it had not been said though he knew it to be true that the keen green eye of the Roman Catholic Church was watching them. There was no church that would offer such strong and effective opposition to the Roman Catholic Church as a united Methodist Church, and a divided Methodist Church was a great source of reproach and weakness. Then it had been urged that there would be an overplus of ministers. That was a simple matter of detail, and when the actual union was consummated would speedily disappear. There was to his mind nothing in lay representation and the episcopacy to frighten them at all. Methodism had prospered in all its forms, and it did not depend for its success upon these small distinctive features, but on the kind of men who were in the work, and they only needed the baptism of the Holy Ghost to make them sure of success even with the extremest form of Methodist Episcopacy.

Rev. A. Langford stated his resolution and moved the adoption of the following first clause as an amendment to the motion:—"That the question of lay representation be referred to a mixed committee to report to the next General Conference as herein provided." In moving this he was not seeking to obtain from the Conference an expression of opinion on the question of union; indeed he was exceedingly anxious to guard the General Conference from giving an expression of opinion on the principles

of union until they had ascertained what the basis of union was. If they did this the only other following Conference. The General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church had held its sessions. Did they find anything in the reports to equal what was now before their Conference? He was exceedingly anxious that they should send down this question of the basis of union to the quarterly meetings untrammelled by anything this Conference might do. Send down the basis of union by all means, and let the people vote on the question of lay representation and the general superintendency, but let the judgment and the voting be uninfluenced by the previous verdict of the General Conference. He intended to vote against the recommendation of the Committee, but not against union. And yet they had been told that this was the position they were assuming. Dr. Burns had pictured the various reasons adduced against union, and had said he would not vote against union for such reasons, but really he submitted that the question of union was not before the Conference now. He was waiting for more information, so that he could give an intelligent vote. He concluded by moving his amendment in a slightly modified form, as follows:—"That this question be referred to the Joint Committee, and that that Committee furnish a basis of union."

Rev. E. A. Stafford was persuaded that there were no difficulties that could not be overcome. He felt that there were some objections to union—for instance, they might get all their membership to stay, but would the membership of the other churches all come into the union? He felt that this might be got over, for he thought that they were dealing with honorable men, and if they voted in their quarterly meetings to go into the union they would do so.

Rev. Dr. Withrow felt that the circumstances never had been, and possibly never would be, as favourable again as they were now for union. He believed that the difficulties were never so few and the facilities were never so many. At the last meeting of the Toronto Conference there were 75 places to be filled, and eight of these were for married men. Then there was the North-West. If all these churches went into the North-West additional difficulties would be made. There is a tide in the affairs of nations and churches, as well as men, which taken at the flood leads on to fortune and success. If they would fail in their object. He concluded by expressing the opinion that a guarantee fund might be raised by a payment of ten cents per member (raising \$73,000), which would tide them over ten years as far as the increased number of ministers was concerned, and then the work would have settled down into its normal shape.

Rev. T. Marshall might be permitted to say that as a member of an Annual Conference he should vote against union. He did not care very much about the form in which the general superintendency might be introduced, it was the man he was opposed to, it seemed to him that they were going to adopt the vital principles of the other churches, and if they once adopted them they would have agitation for the full-blown bishop, as it had been remarked. There were no details of the expenses needed to consummate the union. They were told before the last union they would not be great, and as a matter of fact they had been much greater than they expected. The result was that the brethren on the mission circuits had to pay the bill. He feared that the same thing would occur again. The men on the mission stations last year only averaged \$376, and if they made the grant less what were these brethren to do?

Rev. J. Rogers said history told them that it was the schisms in the Church which had prepared the way for Mohammedanism. Were not the same divisions a source of weakness now?

The amendment of the Rev. Dr. Sutherland, that while this General Conference is not aware of any general desire among the members of the Methodist Church of Canada for lay representation in the Annual Conference, it yet agrees in order to promote union to concede the principle, provided no change is made in regard to the examination of ministerial character or the position of the stationing committee, was adopted.

The following are the members of the Book Committee chosen by the delegates of the three Eastern Conferences: Nova Scotia Conference—Revs. Dr. McMurray, J. Lathern, and W. C. Brown; Messrs. J. W. Smith and J. S. Belcher. New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island—Revs. Dr. Pope, R. Duncan, D. D. Currie and E. Evans; Dr. Inch. Newfoundland—Rev. Dr. Milligan and Hon. C. Ayre.

On notice of motion by Rev. J. Philp to amend paragraph 139 so as to read, "Nor shall a minister be re-appointed to a circuit or mission within a less interval than six years." Rev. Dr. Williams moved the adoption of the motion.

On notice of motion by Rev. J. Philp to amend paragraph 270 of the discipline, respecting the issue of the class tickets. Recommended no change. Adopted.

On notice of motion by Rev. J. Philp to amend paragraph 139 so as to read, "Nor shall a minister be re-appointed to a circuit or mission within a less interval than six years." Rev. Dr. Williams moved the adoption of the motion.

On notice of motion by Rev. J. Philp to amend paragraph 139 so as to read, "Nor shall a minister be re-appointed to a circuit or mission within a less interval than six years." Rev. Dr. Williams moved the adoption of the motion.

On notice of motion by Rev. J. Philp to amend paragraph 139 so as to read, "Nor shall a minister be re-appointed to a circuit or mission within a less interval than six years." Rev. Dr. Williams moved the adoption of the motion.

On notice of motion by Rev. J. Philp to amend paragraph 139 so as to read, "Nor shall a minister be re-appointed to a circuit or mission within a less interval than six years." Rev. Dr. Williams moved the adoption of the motion.

On notice of motion by Rev. J. Philp to amend paragraph 139 so as to read, "Nor shall a minister be re-appointed to a circuit or mission within a less interval than six years." Rev. Dr. Williams moved the adoption of the motion.

On notice of motion by Rev. J. Philp to amend paragraph 139 so as to read, "Nor shall a minister be re-appointed to a circuit or mission within a less interval than six years." Rev. Dr. Williams moved the adoption of the motion.

On notice of motion by Rev. J. Philp to amend paragraph 139 so as to read, "Nor shall a minister be re-appointed to a circuit or mission within a less interval than six years." Rev. Dr. Williams moved the adoption of the motion.

On notice of motion by Rev. J. Philp to amend paragraph 139 so as to read, "Nor shall a minister be re-appointed to a circuit or mission within a less interval than six years." Rev. Dr. Williams moved the adoption of the motion.

On notice of motion by Rev. J. Philp to amend paragraph 139 so as to read, "Nor shall a minister be re-appointed to a circuit or mission within a less interval than six years." Rev. Dr. Williams moved the adoption of the motion.

On notice of motion by Rev. J. Philp to amend paragraph 139 so as to read, "Nor shall a minister be re-appointed to a circuit or mission within a less interval than six years." Rev. Dr. Williams moved the adoption of the motion.

On notice of motion by Rev. J. Philp to amend paragraph 139 so as to read, "Nor shall a minister be re-appointed to a circuit or mission within a less interval than six years." Rev. Dr. Williams moved the adoption of the motion.

On notice of motion by Rev. J. Philp to amend paragraph 139 so as to read, "Nor shall a minister be re-appointed to a circuit or mission within a less interval than six years." Rev. Dr. Williams moved the adoption of the motion.

On notice of motion by Rev. J. Philp to amend paragraph 139 so as to read, "Nor shall a minister be re-appointed to a circuit or mission within a less interval than six years." Rev. Dr. Williams moved the adoption of the motion.