

ment does give the Conference the power to take it from them?

It *does* "make a difference whose ox has been gored;" but so far as that insinuation affects the case, it applies as much to the views of the *Guardian* as to those of the *Canadian Independent*: and, not unlikely, if the editor of that journal had invested his *all*, religiously, in that little church and parsonage at Galt, and saw it about to be taken from him, and his fellow-members, by a body which he could not conscientiously join, he might "see the question in a different light." We should be very sorry of course, if the Bond Street Congregational Church should turn Methodist,—the case the *Guardian* supposes; but of this we are very sure, that if such a thing should ever occur, by the unanimous action of the Trustees and of all the members, the Congregational Union would never enter a suit in Chancery to deprive them of their property.

Only our "ignorance of Methodism" saved us from the charge of "wilful misrepresentation" when we spoke of Conference "holding in its hands all the property of the denomination." The *Guardian* stoutly denies that such is the fact, or that the chapel-deed can ever be "a weapon which Conference may hold in *terrorem* over" the local church. *Technically* he is correct, but *practically* his denial is so disingenuous and comes so near to something even worse, that we should not care to characterize it. Is the *Guardian* prepared to say that the fear of losing their chapel has never been used, in Galt or elsewhere, as "a gentle persuasive" to anti-unionists to come to terms? If Confer-

ence "cannot" so use the chapel-deed, what have all those who have so far refused to come in been afraid of?

Whether we "went out of (our) way to make an unworthy assault upon the Methodist Church," or whether it was not the *Guardian* which first assailed us, we leave our readers to judge. Surely the Methodist Church is not infallible, or altogether above criticism; and if not, may one never express an opinion regarding any of its proceedings without being charged with being "offensive and unjust," having "conference on the brain," and "violating both Christian courtesy, truthfulness of statement and sound reasoning?" And after all, will the *Guardian* affirm that the ecclesiastical polity of Methodism is anything but a "human invention?" Is there any trace of the Itinerancy in the New Testament? Any of a "connexion" of churches? By whom was Methodism founded? If it be the Apostolic plan, let us know it and follow it; but if not, it is surely not above examination. We did not claim for Congregationalism that it is "Christ's plan," although we have no objection to the *Guardian* so understanding us; but this at least is beyond dispute, that some of the best ecclesiastical historians have held that view. And we therefore, cordially invite our contemporary to try his logic upon the "modest claim" which he thinks has such "a touch of genuine Papal assumption about it" as to class us with "Lynch and Manning," and to remind him of the "Guibord case." Let us hear the result, brother, when you get through.

We are asked,—“Is there anything