

in law to the property, that Presbytery, in most unjust and oppressive manner, encouraged the defeated unionists to try the case in law. Expensive litigations have been the consequence, which, though they had not a shadow of justice to go upon, were yet carried on in order to ruin us, and finally resulted in their obtaining the use of the church half the day.

In this case the property was not only ours by a double deed before the passing of the Act, but ours also—as the magistrate declared—in strict accordance with it, by our having a majority of male votes. Look then at the whole facts of the case: On our side you see a minister—a kirk session—four faithful trustees—and a congregation embracing a *majority* of lawful voters, who erected the church at their own expense. On the other side you see no minister—no session—one faithless trustee—and *three* persons *not even Church-members and therefore not allowed to vote*, yet who swore they were both members and managers, *in order to act as Plaintiffs*, with one or two more lately irregularly received from outsiders, and a handful of hostile unionists who never gave a dollar for the church, with a *minority* of voters including one convicted of making a false oath in his affidavit, which false oath was supported by all the other Plaintiffs, also swearing falsely in their affidavits. Yet in this case also a late Chancery decision gave the church to the said unionists, taking it from me and my congregation—our trustees being obliged also to pay their heavy law-costs, as well as their own, and interdicted under forty thousand dollars' penalties (\$40,000) from using it again for behoof of the Scotch congregation.

As to these decisions of the Court of Chancery I pass no opinion—the public will judge of them. And the public may well enquire what sort of an Act must that be which yields such an abundant crop of strife and trouble, of law-suits and losses! Is this the boasted Act that was to promote Christian union, peace, and love!!! Better the rule of a despot than such a law! If such are really our laws, Heaven help the man whose property is sufficiently valuable to be coveted by unionists! What a pity Provincial Legislatures were not invented in the days of Jezebel. Poor Naboth need not have been stoned for blasphemy, so as to allow Ahab to get possession of the coveted vineyard. The simple smuggling of a Seizure or "Union Bill" through the said Legislatures would have settled the matter and saved blood-letting.

Far be it from me to deny that in a Unionist's view there may be sufficient law in their Act to strip us of our property. I believe the bloody Judge Jefferies, of the seventeenth century, also maintained he had sufficient law to plunder and torture the Nonconformists, and that even Claverhouse himself boasted he had sufficient law to burn the Covenanters and blow out the brains of John Brown—but we simply deny the rectitude or justice of such doings.