

I have proven, what are they? Simply what they call themselves, "dissentients." They could be nothing else. Mr. Lang admitted yesterday that 15 were necessary to form a quorum, or constitute a meeting of the Synod. Then, we ask, how could 7 or 9 constitute a Synod? "Oh!" he says, "they just considered that it was the same *sederunt*, and went ahead with the business." He forgot, or forgot to state, that the Synod had adjourned, and that these men of necessity took part in the adjournment, and that by no possibility could it be the same meeting.

REV. MR. LANG.—In the face of a protest.

PRINCIPAL GRANT.—Of course they protested. They have never done anything else. But the Committee is aware that if two or three members of the House of Commons protest against the House adjourning, the House can adjourn all the same, and the protest of the two or three rebellious members makes no difference.

MR. MACMASTER.—They cannot dissolve themselves entirely.

PRINCIPAL GRANT.—We are talking of an adjournment. Suppose that the House of Commons should find it necessary, because its Chamber, for some special occasion, was not large enough—precisely our case—suppose that the House, because of an alarm of fire or for some other reason, should resolve to adjourn to a larger hall for a few hours, and that they did adjourn, and regularly departed, with the Speaker at their head, the Clerks, the Mace—whatever the Mace may mean—and that a few malcontents remained, and, pretending that they were the House of Commons, passed laws; would these be binding on the people of Canada? Suppose that some one should say to the malcontents, or dissenters, "Why! you have not even a quorum," the ready answer would be, "Oh! to the eye of sense we are only 9, but to the eye of faith we are 200. We include in our number the men who have gone away to do the wicked thing against which we have protested. It is the same *sederunt*." Quoting a Latin word like that, you know, would clinch the argument. "The same *sederunt*!" Mr. Chairman, if 9 could do this when 15 were required, could not 5, could not 3 do it? Could not 1 sit in solitary grandeur, and say, "I am the Old Kirk; I am going on with the business?" I see by the Minutes that there were more members at our meeting in the morning than when the vote was taken the evening before. 126 members of Synod went, with moderator, clerks and documents, to the larger hall; 9 dissented, and they have remained dissenting protesting and litigating to this day. And still they cry, "Give us more litigation; don't legislate, gentlemen." They have fared so long on litigation that they want nothing else. I think that I have shown what follows from the principles proved at the outset, as regards the parties