

I shall not use it. But, Mr. Chairman, if the figurative and expressive word suggested by Mr. Macmaster's friend, Mr. Buntin, yesterday, is parliamentary—"balderdash"—I would use that. Mr. Lang knows well that entering into union involves no sacrifice of position or of orders. Now let me come to the point. What was the right procedure for us to take when we desired to effect union? I think I have established that it was possible to unite, that if ever two Churches could unite we were the two. What was the right method for us to take? Three things had to be done. First, we had to proceed constitutionally, as far as our own Church was concerned. Secondly, we had to proceed constitutionally as far as legislation was concerned; and, thirdly, we had to deal with courtesy towards all men, especially towards those with whom we were most nearly related. We would not unite until we had taken these three steps. First, what did we do as regards the Church? After unanimously approving the principle again and again, after unanimously adopting the basis of union, we acted according to the constitutional method of our Church, and the constitutional method of all Presbyterian Churches, as stated by the authority that these brethren recognize, our own book of forms, and "Cook's Styles of the Church of Scotland." According to these authorities, when the Supreme Court is attempting a constitutional change, it must send it down to the lower Courts, that they may consider and vote upon it. They return their views to the Supreme Court. We sent it down to these lower Courts, called Presbyteries. Presbyteries hold somewhat the same relation to the Supreme Court that Diocesan Synods hold to the Provincial Synod of the Church of England. We sent the question, then, down to the Presbyteries, and ten out of our eleven Presbyteries reported in favour. A few changes were made to suit men who objected, and it was sent down again, and then every Presbytery adopted it; so that we had not only our Synod, but every one of our lower Courts, on the side of union. That is all that the Constitution of the Church in Canada, or of the parent Church, required us to do; because, gentlemen, our Courts are understood, like your high Court of Parliament, to represent the people. Our Synod and Presbyteries have no \$5 or \$50 men in them. They are representative.

MR. MACMASTER.—Or half a million dollar men.

PRINCIPAL GRANT.—No; our Church does not believe in selling the right to deliberate or the right to vote. That, I say, is all we need have done. The Presbyteries had spoken, and that was enough. But we said, "This is a matter on which people feel strongly; we are living in a country that is essentially democratic in spirit, and we will send it down to the congregations. And when did we send it down? Only after they had had time to discuss it and re-discuss it. It had been in