

render their report as respects themselves, difficult, and as to those more immediately interested, very likely less satisfactory than if consecutively stated.

The first point for the consideration of Bridgewater Division, and which seems to have given them great difficulty, was, whether Brother Slocomb had by evidence brought himself within the By-Laws entitling him to benefits. The Division had so much difficulty in deciding upon this evidence, that there was first a resolution granting benefits, and then another resolution rescinding the same, and the statements of the evidence before your Committee are such that they cannot say the Division were wrong, or their decision upon it.

Your Committee also state that the charge against the Treasurer for refusing to pay the order for Brother Slocomb's benefits, was investigated by the Bridgewater Division, from which he was acquitted, and the fact that the Report of the Financial Committee shewed funds in the Treasurer's hands, is explained thus: The order was drawn on the 16th October, and the dues of the Division were paid in at the end of the month, before which time there might not have been funds. Therefore upon the propriety or impropriety of the Treasurer's conduct, your Committee cannot decide, as that also has been decided by the Division.

The only question now remaining is, whether the rescinding the Resolution for granting benefits to Brother Slocomb, was in order. To settle this question we must refer to the extract of the minutes, by which it appears that the Resolution granting Brother Slocomb benefits, passed on the 16th October. On the 30th of the same month there is the following entry:—"Moved by Brother Wheelock, seconded by Brother Belunney,—Whereas on the evening of the 16th October a Resolution passed this Division granting 19 weeks' benefits to Brother Slocomb, said Resolution not being in accordance with our Laws,—Resolved, therefore, that it be rescinded; laid on the table for one week." November 6th—"Motion for rescinding Resolution relative to Brother Slocomb's 19 weeks' benefits, passed."

A Session having intervened the Session of passing their original Resolution, and the Session of moving the Resolution to rescind, a motion was no longer available for this Session. Therefore the motion to rescind was the proper course, and having laid one week on the table, was regular in all its stages. There seems to have been a mis-apprehension as to Resolutions officially passing out of the Division, the one in question being supposed to be thus situated.

Your Committee are under the impression that a Resolution to be thus submitted means its passing from a subordinate to the Grand Division.

Your Committee therefore see no reason for interfering with the decision of the Bridgewater Division, relative to Brother Slocomb's benefits, all which is submitted in L. P & F.

S. L. MORSE,
H. E. FITCH,
GEO. WHITMAN.

Passed.