

upon they would not ; and so in this case ; but such their conduct has nevertheless cast a *foul stigma* upon the good government, and fair character of our City.

As additional proof of the propriety of my Petition to have the matter enquired into under oath, I cite the pleas or defences set up by the Rev. D. Inglis and his Elders and Deacons whom I sued for their said assault of me, as soon as I felt that the chances of life were in my favor, although I am still suffering deeply and my life is still in danger therefrom ; Messrs Burton Sadlier & Bruee are the Solicitors of the Rev. D. Inglis and the two Constables, and Walter Macdonald, Esq., is solicitor for the other defendants. These defences had to be verified by *oath* before same could be set up, the oath being, "I am advised and believe that the pleas are true in substance and in fact." That oath the Statute allows either the Defendant or his Solicitor to make. In this case, the Solicitors, namely, Mr. Burton and Mr. Macdonald made the necessary oath, above cited, although the defendants were all in the city ; here again they *avoided* making oath to their statements. I asked these Solicitors why they made the oath when their clients could be got upon a few minutes notice ? Mr. Macdonald gave no answer. Mr. Burton replied, "my plea in substance amounts to this, that the defendants (the constables) *were called in as Peace Officers, to remove you from the church in consequence of your non-compliance with certain regulations of the church authorities*, and did remove you"; which oath he said he made upon "a written statement which he obtained from his clients," the constables. Thus you clearly see that the constables were not *really* called in as Peace Officers as falsely alleged, as they do not pretend to say that I was guilty of a breach of the Peace, but they were simply and solely the *bull dogs* of the other defendants, to carry out their pre-concerted designs, called by Mr. Burton, "certain regulations of the church authorities," the words "Peace Officers" being a mere blind ; Constables being *public* officers, for the *sole* performance of *public* duties prescribed by the public law of the land ; and not for the execution of the *orders* of any private body, such as Deacons or Elders of a church. Here is therefore an express admission by these Constables of a very gross violation of their office.

Mr. Macdonald on behalf of his clients—the other defendants—set up as one defence for them, that Robert Hopkins and Andrew Skinner, (two of them) were *possessed* of two lots of land whereon was erected "*a building* called the Maennb Street Presbyterian Church," and that because on the Sabbath day in question, I entered that "*building*" or "*Church*," without the *leave or license* of said Hopkin and Skinner, and "*disturbed them* in their *possession* of the Church," that they "*in defence* of such their *possession*