

bought birthrights of God's people, and shamelessly trafficked in the best interests of our congregations.

Revelations, startling yet true, remain to be made of the manner our people were led to the slaughter house—the Victoria Skating Rink.

The corporal's guard that continued the session of the Synod in St. Paul's, Montreal, on the 15th June, 1875, represented the Synod of the Presbyterian Church of Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland. No one present of their number, nor any of the seceders questioned the quorum. The diet of the morning was continued under the ægis of a notarial protest, which the Clerk of the Synod has omitted to embody, or even to mention in the printed minutes. In reference to a quorum of Synod, the Expositor is invited to turn to the minutes of Synod 1831, and he will there find how many ministers constituted the Synod at its initiation. Eleven ministers, all told, and two elders. Mr. Robert Campbell's logic and argument is, eleven ministers and two elders can constitute a Synod, but fifteen is the least number to carry it on—the wonder is that the versatility of his talent did not evoke the law *ex necessitate*. But like many Expositors, he gets befogged when dealing with constitutional principles.

In 1832, (see minutes, Session II., Diet I.) six ministerial members and two elders constituted the quorum, and maintained their right to do so. On the following morning, Diet II., ten ministers and two elders formed and constituted the Court. Mr. Robert Campbell does not perceive the relevancy of these precedents. No! They don't suit him.

"No opposition was offered by the minority to the adjournment on the 15th June, 1875." The effrontery of this statement is consummate in the light of the facts. The coolness of this statement is only matched by the deafness of the late Clerk of Synod, Mr. John H. McKerras, who on oath declared he did not hear the notarial protest read, and therefore did not record it, because the Court took no action upon it. No, but the Court took action in opposition to it, and the contention is, by the firm of Lang, Burnet & Co., that they were thereby assailed from the action of the majority. They claim, therefore,