

good measure, pressed down and shaken together, and running over, shall men give unto your bosom." Present His claim as He presents it, and let men settle with Him, and not with you, if they think He demands too much !

One thing seems tolerably clear from the statements of the General Secretary-Treasurer, now twice repeated in these columns, that unless our income can be increased, we must either retrench *somewhere* or plunge into debt. We trust we may be spared the pain, we had almost said the disgrace, of either.

THE GALT CASE AGAIN.

We are sorry that our generally excellent contemporary, the *Christian Guardian*, should lose his temper over our rejoinder on the Galt church case, and reply with hard words instead of hard arguments. We think we made it clear to the apprehension of most persons who read our article, that Congregationalists have not taken, and have no intention of taking any steps to "seize" the Galt property. That property is deeded to "*the Methodist New Connexion Society at Galt*," and it is the business of the Trustees of that Society, not ours, to look after the legal questions raised by the claim of the Methodist Conference. We sympathize strongly with them in their assertion of the right of self-government, and their claim to the church and parsonage which they have erected, just as we should sympathize with any anti-union Presbyterian congregation in similar circumstances. But we repeat, for the sake of the *Guardian*, that it is the Galt congrega-

tion, and not "the Congregationalists," who dispute the right of the Methodist Conference to the property in question. And if we and other Congregational ministers are holding service in the church about the title to which there is this dispute, it is only at their request, and because they do not choose to relinquish their claim to the property until the case is decided for or against them. The question between us is not, as the *Guardian* puts it, "whether a church, erected through the labours and contributions of the members of a particular religious faith, and held in trust by Trustees for that purpose, is the private property of these Trustees in such a sense, that if they change their creed they have a right to change the purpose of the church, in accordance with their change of creed?" To such a question we answer, unhesitatingly, No ! Trustees can hold property only in accordance with the provisions of the deed which creates the trust. Their "change of creed" cannot alienate the property from its original uses, and ought not to do so. But is this the case described ? The Trustees and the people are at one, and consider that to hand it over to the Methodist Conference would be to divert the property from its original uses, one of which was, to protest against certain features of Wesleyan Methodism, looked upon by them as unscriptural and exclusive, and which, they claim, remain substantially unchanged under the new discipline. And the real question is, whether a congregation so united, and holding such convictions, should be deprived of their church and parsonage, even if the Act of Parlia-