

in this case. May I now submit another point. What follows from the two principles established, as regards other Churches, so far as their relations to Parliament are concerned, should this remedial legislation be refused? This Parliament is just. It will measure to others—I give no taffy—but I think I may assume that Parliament will mete to others the measure that it metes to us. Now, if you take, with regard to us the action our opponents desire, what must be taken with regard to other Churches? First, as regards the future: Parliament must refuse legislation to any Churches that resolve to unite, should there be one man opposed to such union. You must say, “You cannot do it; this one man has the right to the property. Oh! yes, you may unite, but you cannot take your property with you.” What does this mean? It means that in the future, if there should be a man in any Church sufficiently foreseeing, he may take such a line as this: He may say, “My Church is ready to unite with a sister Church. I will support the proposal. I will move the adoption of the basis of union. I will get my brethren hopelessly committed. I will let years pass away, till my action has perhaps been forgotten. Then, when the others are ready and all things are in readiness, I will quietly rise in my place and say, ‘Gentlemen, of course you are perfectly free to unite, but I shall remain and I shall demand all the property.’” Is not that possible? Is not that what you in principle say, if you refuse this legislation? And this may be a good man, too. He may be convinced that he is doing right; he may take his stand upon principle, and say that his conscience is enlightened. There is not the slightest doubt that this could be done, and this Parliament, having taken its position already, is bound to that position, for, as I said, you will mete to others the measure you mete to us. And you are likely to be called on to act in the future, gentlemen. At this very moment there are two cases likely enough to come before Parliament some day. The Methodist Church and the Methodist Episcopal Church are talking about union. I see in the newspapers that they are having district meetings, and that these meetings are unanimously in favour of union. Suppose, now, that all the district meetings and conferences unanimously resolve to unite; that they have arranged the details and have got everything settled; then, after all the leading ministers and the men who will not go back from their positions have committed themselves, and they come to you for legislation, should one worthy man rise up and object, you must say to these half million Methodists, or their representatives, “We cannot do what you ask; we have taken our position; you can go into the union, but that protesting individual claims all the property, and it must remain with him.” Take another case. The dioceses of the Church of England in the North-West are not now united with the Provincial Synod of Canada. They are connected with the Mother Church in England. Suppose they agree—and I hope they will—that there should be but one Episcopal Church in Canada, as there is one Presbyterian Church, and as there