

posed to carry with them to the Synod the latest wishes of those whom they represented. In this aspect of the case,—that substantial expression was given to the views of the people,—Vice-Chancellor Proudfoot acquiesced, in the judgment already cited.

II.

It is tantamount to a defiance of the Legislatures and Courts of Canada, for Messrs. Lang, Burnet & Company to persist in maintaining that they are "the Presbyterian Church of Canada in connexion with the Church of Scotland." Having satisfied themselves that the several separate Presbyterian Churches were desirous of uniting, the Parliaments, having jurisdiction over the properties of the said Churches, granted the requisite facilities for the carrying of the proposed Union into effect. The Preambles of the several Bills begin by stating that "the Presbyterian Church of Canada in connexion with the Church of Scotland" had agreed to unite with the other Churches named. The minority offered what opposition they could to the passage of the Union Acts in Ontario and Quebec. They applied to Vice-Chancellor Proudfoot for an injunction, restraining the Moderator of the Synod, in 1874, from applying in the name of the Synod to Parliament for legislation, but he refused to grant it, (*Toronto Globe*, Dec. 16, 1874); so that the Legislatures were duly informed of their pretensions before the Acts were passed; yet they satisfied themselves that the majority were the true Church, and as such were entitled to have the property of the Church secured to them. They could scarcely have done anything else, if they considered it their function at all to legislate according to the wishes of the people; for rarely, I presume, is so much unanimity shewn by any class of citizens, when Acts of Parliament, so large a number, are under discussion. The number in this case opposing the measures when submitted to the Parliaments, was so small, that the several legislatures passed the Acts without much hesitation, after due enquiry.

In some of those law-suits, to which reference has already been made, the anti-Unionists put forward the plea that the adjourned meeting of Synod, held at Toronto in November, 1874, was illegally constituted; and, as it was this meeting which authorized the legislation that was subsequently procured of the several local Parlia-