

consisted, as a rule, of grave, wise, steady going men, who were not in the habit of boiling over with enthusiasm, and, above all, who had no notion of effecting union through the door of disunion. They had no notion of uniting, if they could not go in as a Church. They repudiated such an idea. They wanted to lessen not to increase the number of sects. If we had dreamed that our action would have led to disunion we would never have thought of action. We were so long a time about it, from 1870 to 1875, that Mr. Lang pleaded pathetically yesterday that his moving the adoption of the basis of union in 1871 should not be referred to now, because there was such "a very long time" between 1871 and 1875. That means, in other words, that he adopted our basis of union in 1871, and that if we had only been quicker, if we had only been in a hurry about it, if we had had, for instance, a little Methodist fire and alertness, Mr. Lang would have been in the union.

REV. MR. LANG.—My resolution was for amending, not adopting.

PRINCIPAL GRANT.—Amending on a small point, but adopting, as stated yesterday, the basis of union. Rev. Mr. Macdonnell seconded your resolution. Mr. Lang now says, to justify his position: "There is such a thing as principle; there is such a thing as conscience." No doubt, Mr. Chairman, but I would he had found the principle sooner. Mr. Lang had influence in our Synod. Not only did he move approval, but he was an alternate member of a Committee to draw up the basis of union. When we appointed that Committee, we appointed an alternate for each member of it, so that should any member be ill a substitute might take his place. Mr. Lang was an alternate, and so remained for years. There were doubtless humbler and younger members who were ready to accept the principle of union because so influential a minister as Mr. Lang was in favour of it. Is he not responsible for their action? Is he not responsible for the position they now occupy? I wish to say this to the Committee most emphatically, that if Mr. Lang and his friends had said at the outset, "We are in principle opposed to this union; we in conscience are opposed to it," then, Sir, not only the gentlemen who are acting with me here, but the whole Synod, would have dropped at once all negotiations for union. That would have been the last of it. Our position was this: "Union is a good thing, but not at the price of disunion among ourselves. We are sorry that these gentlemen have such consciences; we could wish that their consciences were more enlightened; but as they are conscientiously opposed to union we must drop the subject and attend to our ordinary work." He now says: "I am in favour of union, but am I to sacrifice my position as a Minister of the Church of Scotland; am I to give up my orders?" Mr. Chairman, I will not characterize that language by the expression used by Mr. Lang in reference to an accurate statement made by Mr. Fleming—"mendacious." The word is unparliamentary, and therefore