

inserted last session to protect the minority if the latter had asked for it, it should be inserted now in order to remedy the injustice which had been done. The Manvers circuit had dissented from the union altogether, and the lay delegate from that circuit had voted against it at the Conference in June, 1874. He did not think it would be any injury to a church professing Christianity to do justice to their neighbours. They wanted to be protected in the enjoyment of the property which was created by their money, instead of being turned out of it by a bill in Chancery, which had been filed by their opponents. If any other means could be devised by those who opposed the Bill by which this property could be secured, he would be willing to go as far as possible to meet their views. These people in Manvers were the earliest founders of Methodism there, and they felt having this property being taken away very strongly. He did not insist upon the clause absolutely as it stood. If Christian feeling had been shown he thought these people would have come into the union ultimately, but the high-handed course pursued against them had "got their Irish up."

In answer to Mr. Clarke (Norfolk),

Mr. ARMOUR said there were six of these churches in Manvers. He did not know why the original deeds of three of them were got rid of and new ones obtained. He understood that Mr. Maguire, one of the promoters, was a member of the New Connexion Church. He believed he destroyed the original deed because he thought it was useless.

Senator Aikens appeared on behalf of the Methodist Church of Canada. There were about 600 signatures to the petition for this Bill, but he found from the official records that there were only 300 members in the Manvers circuit, comprising the townships of Manvers and Cartwright. The majority of those were, he was informed, in favour of union, so that not 150 members could have signed the petition, though it purported to be signed by 600 members. He could not understand the ignorance of these petitioners of the passage of the Act, because the subject was discussed for two or three years in all these church courts, in which, in the New Connexion, laymen were represented, and before the Act was passed the United Conference met. The trusts of the different bodies were not changed at all. The United Church had no power to interfere with the trusts at all, which remained as they were except where the parties to them chose to come under the model deed. In the Presbyterian body there was a previous agreement that the dissentient congregations should hold their property, but there was no such agreement prior to the Methodist union, to which there were very few dissentients. The Methodist Church was a connexion, not a conglomeration of congregations, and trustees held the property for the whole body. In most cases the greater part of the money was not contributed by the members of the particular church, and yet by this Bill a majority of the congregation could take the church building to which they had contributed little away from the body to which it belonged. Such a condition as this was never mentioned before the union, and it had been introduced the union would never have been consummated. There had never in the several parties to the union been heard of any such power to secede.

Mr. ROBT. WILKES said he had taken a prominent part in all the negotiations and meetings with a view to union as a member of the New Connexion Church. He explained the steps taken by that Church, their agreement to union on conditions, the assent of the English parent body, and the final declaration of union by the last Conference of the New Connexion Church, leaving all details of legislation to the united body, which was unanimously adopted, delegates being present from these very circuits which now asked for the passage of this Bill. The notices of the passage of the Act of last year were published in the *Ontario Gazette* and in the *Guardian*, the official organ of the two bodies, and the circuits which had been referred to were each represented by a minister and a lay representative. There could, therefore be no pretence that these circuits were not fully advised of the union. If the majority of these congregations had desired to join some other body before this union, the New Connexion could not have allowed them to do so. The present proposal was a complete novelty in Methodism, and the Methodist New Connexion Church in England had no sympathy with it. These gentlemen had no New Connexion Conference left, and they would therefore have to join some other body, and take their property with

them. That would be a very dangerous precedent, and a principle which had never been admitted by either of the now united bodies.

Mr. ARMOUR protested against the principle that the majority of the voting members of a church could carry over the property of the whole body to another Church.

Mr. PATTERSON (Essex) said churches were generally held in trust for the whole body and built by the contributions of others not of the particular locality.

Mr. MEREDITH said the Wesleyans might not have gone into the union if this condition had been enforced.

Mr. HARDY suggested that it would be unreasonable to introduce an element of secession into the whole Church now that the union had been consummated.

Rev. Mr. DEWART made a few remarks alleging that this Bill was principally promoted by the Bible Christians, whom these dissentients intended to join. It was not pretended that it was intended to keep the congregations portions of the New Connexion Church.

Mr. ARMOUR said these parties had not gone over to the Bible Christians.

In answer to Mr. Lauder,

Senator AIKENS said the Act adopted by the Legislature was the same as that adopted by all the other Provinces.

Mr. GRAHAM (Lambton) was a member of the Episcopal Methodist Church, and believed this Bill would introduce an element of discord into the Church. Still, he thought a provision should be made protecting these people in the enjoyment of their Church property.

Mr. HARDY pointed out that the effect of the Bill would be to change the whole polity of the Methodist Church, and to introduce an element which had not been proposed or agreed to before Union.

Mr. SEXTON said if the object of the Bill were simply to give relief to these parties he might vote for it, but could not vote for a proposal to shatter the whole Methodist Church of Canada.

A division was then taken on the question whether the preamble was proved, which was lost on the following vote.—

YEAS.—Messrs. Currie, Ballantine, Graham (Lambton), McMahon, Tooley, Williams, Wilson.—7.

NAYS.—Messrs. McDougall (Simcoe), Baker, Broder, Clarke (Norfolk), Cole, Dawson, Finlayson, Grant, Hardy, Lauder, McGowan, Meredith, Merrick, Monk, Patterson (Essex), Patterson (York), Preston, Richardson, Scott, Sexton, Sinclair, Snetsinger.—22.

The Committee shortly after adjourned.