

should it be deemed necessary. Mr. Lang even objected to the small number of the Committee applying for legislation. Surely, whether a Committee consists of four members or forty makes not the slightest difference. Our way is to appoint a Committee, and we never dream of asking whether the Committee is small or large. It does the work. Besides, we have seeking this legislation not only the Committee appointed by the old Synod, but the Committee of the General Assembly in defence of Church property. Our way of doing business may be a very foolish way; but it is our way, and no Presbyterian would dream of there being any other way. Everyone will see at once that, as to our calling a meeting of the General Assembly, the thing is out of the question. It is not needed. Besides, to call a meeting of a Synod of thirteen clergymen, half of them relieved of the cares of congregational work, and to summon a body consisting of 400 representatives, from British Columbia to Newfoundland, are two very different things. If we did so, it would excite public feeling immensely, and that is not desirable, surely. It would be a most unwise proceeding to take. I think the Committee may rest assured that our Church is a unit on this subject, and if my friend fancies that we are disunited he is trusting to a devout imagination. However, these are all small matters, and I would not have referred to them had they not been brought up by our opponents; it was necessary that I should clear the way by these preliminary observations. I now go on to the real question before the Committee. I take it for granted that this Committee wants to get at the root of the matter, and not merely to be entertained with a threshing of old straw as to details that has been threshed for eight years before the country, till not a particle of grain is to be got out of it.

The Committee wants to get at the principles involved in this case. Well, Mr. Chairman, I think that there are two principles involved, and if I do not prove these I have no case. I think I can prove them, and if proved, two sets of consequences logically follow. The first principle I would ask this Committee to consider is, has a Church any freedom of action as regards uniting with another Church? It may seem easy to assent to such a question, but the whole case rests upon this very simple question. I put it in another form: Is there any possible way of one Church uniting with another? I would like that question to be understood by the Committee. Is there any possible way, yes or no, of one Church uniting with another? Well, we believed, and we still believe, that it is possible for one Church to unite with another. Believing that general statement, everyone will admit that, *a fortiori*, two Churches that are one in doctrine, as we were and are; one in Church government, as we were and are; one in Church discipline, as we were and are; one in modes of procedure, as we were and are; one in generic name, for we were all Presbyterian; one in race, as we were and are; one in spiritual ancestry, as we were and are, may unite; that if