

The eloquent address of Dr. Douglas at the educational anniversary, at St. Catharines, attracted much public attention. A few isolated statements, dislocated from their connection, which appeared in the *Toronto Globe*, gave a distorted impression of what we consider the general scope and tendency of his remarks. It may be true that there are fewer Methodists in parliament than there are of some other denominations, but we opine that the reason for this is something other than the inferior education of the Methodist people. The Methodist Church is more evenly divided politically than is the Presbyterian, or Roman Catholic, or Episcopal Church; and as a Church it scrupulously refrains from mingling in the troubled sea of party politics. Yet we have had our Methodist members of parliament and ministers of the Crown, and even occupants of a higher station still, whose record we need not fear to compare with that of their compeers. Should the ultramontane aggressions of the Church of Rome, or any other great question, so assert its predominance as to obliterate party lines, and unite the moral convictions of the Methodist community on public matters, we conceive that they could furnish a solid parliamentary phalanx inferior in ability and education to none in any legislature the country has ever had. It would, we judge, be found not altogether impossible to imagine a ministry in which Methodists would be duly represented, which should at least be the equal in education and intelligence of any that we have seen of late years.

#### THE WESLEYANS AND THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

DR. WORDSWORTH, Bishop of Lincoln, has recently had a conference with certain leading Wesleyan ministers, with the view of ascertaining whether Wesleyan Dissent cannot be restored to the bosom of Mother Church. In order to accomplish this result his lordship indicated three necessary preliminaries: That Wes-

leyan ministers receive English orders, that is, deny the validity of their previous ordination, and humbly sue for the imposition of Episcopal hands, in order to be recognized as ministers of the Church of England; that Wesleyan "chapels" must be specially licensed before the Anglican "clergy" could preach or administer the sacraments therein; and that the congregations of such chapels as are licensed for preaching only "be exhorted to resort to their respective parish churches for the reception of the holy communion." And this is the amount of inducement offered by a liberal bishop to induce the Wesleyans to forsake the glorious traditions of well nigh a hundred years, and brand whole generations of their spiritual ancestry as schismatics. We greatly mistake the spirit of English Methodism if it will not spurn as an insult such a degrading proposition. And this gracious concession is proffered by a prelate of a Church that has just driven from a public school a most efficient teacher for nothing but the crime of being a Methodist; that outrages the feelings of a grief-stricken father over the grave of his child by wantonly and, as the highest civil courts declare, illegally denying his ministerial status; that denies Methodist mourners, in the hour of their most poignant sorrow, the privilege of laying their dead—a parent, wife, or child—in the ancestral graveyards of the nation, with the consoling rites of religion conducted by the honoured pastors of their Church—in which respect it is imitated, of all the Churches of Europe, only by that of decrepit Spain. Those rites must be celebrated on the public highway, outside of the consecrated ground, and then the dead borne in and covered up in silence forever. And the Great Council of the nation, by its rejection of the Burials' Bill, has just confirmed this Church in its intolerance, and made the peaceful God's Acre of the quiet dead the arena for the exhibition of sectarian bigotry. Whom God would destroy He first infatuates, said the