

country, as I think the very genius of our National Church should be inclusiveness as far as possible, and not exclusiveness. Let us hold fast by that which is good in the past. Our Presbytery is good, let us then hold fast by our Presbyterian Government; and, in reference to that I beg to say, in passing, that there never was a greater delusion than to imagine that the wish to have an organ, the wish to have a more cultivated form of worship, has anything to do with Episcopacy. ("Hear," and applause.) I believe that, instead of that, it is an order to keep back Episcopacy and take the power out of its hands. (Applause.) I make bold to say, as a member of the National Church of Scotland, that I think it is my duty, as well as in accordance with my feelings, to stretch out a kind hand to every Scotchman, and, if I could, a kind and protecting hand to every Church in this kingdom. I would say, with perfect respect for the Episcopal Church, that never was there a period since Covenanting times in which the whole clergy and office-bearers of the Church of Scotland were more solemnly determined to resist Episcopacy than at this present moment. (Loud applause.) I say let us hold fast by our Presbytery; no one wishes to change it; it is mere delusion to suppose that. For my part, when I go to England I am quite ready to attend the national place of worship. I have read its liturgy for months together, and I never performed many of its services, and I never travel without doing it; but on this side the Tweed I am out and out a staunch Presbyterian, and I would resist all encroachments on it to the death. Dr. McLeod concluded his able speech as follows:—What are our powers at this moment? I hold that no individual minister is entitled to introduce any change into his congregation. I hold that is the province of the kirk-session, and so completely do I carry that out, that even in cases of baptism they are brought before the session. I do everything with my session of elders and deacons. I hold that that is the truest check, and that no ministers should bring in any change without his kirk session. Now I think you ought, so far as you possibly can, to give every liberty to congregations; but supposing anything outrageous is done—something done which the people or congregation do not want—you have always the appeal to the Presbytery, and I hold that the Presbytery has a constitutional right of veto, though I do not think Presbyteries will be disposed to know the feelings of the congregation; and, depend upon it, if the minister and session are unanimous, you need no legislation in the matter for they have too much sense to act against the wishes of the people. I do not see that it requires any law. I imagine it is the present law that any one can bring such matters before the Presbytery by appeal. I confess I do not wish the Presbytery to interfere with it, if the minister

and elders are unanimous, because one or two crotchety people object. This is law as it stands, but you must not make it too stringent. You speak about preserving the purity of the Church. No man desires it more than I do; but take care by your stringency you do not tempt men to rebel, and cast themselves on public opinion—("Hear," and applause)—as against the clergy and the church courts. Do not interfere so long as you secure, what there should be no great difficulty in securing—namely, the decent order of the worship of God. If anything outrageous is done, you have perfect power to try it by constitutional law and without any new enactment; and as I think Dr. Stevenson's motion meets for all practical purposes the whole case, I on grounds of Christian liberty, on the ground of our duty as a national Church, and on grounds of common sense, heartily agree to his motion. (Loud applause.)

WEDNESDAY, May 24.

The Assembly met this day at noon.—Dr. Macfarlane, Moderator,—and resumed the debate on Innovations in Public Worship, when Dr. Lee spoke at some length on the subject.

A vote was then taken between the motions of Dr. Crawford and Professor Stevenson, when the latter was carried by seven votes—the numbers being 156 to 149. A second division took place, between the motion of Professor Stevenson and the original motion of Dr. Pirie, when the latter was carried by 173 against 140 votes—a majority of 33. The announcement of the result was received with loud demonstrations of satisfaction and disapproval. Dr. Lee protested and appealed against the decision, for himself and all who might adhere to him; and Dr. N. Macleod, Principal Tulloch, Rev. R. Wallace, and others, intimated their adherence to the protest. The Assembly then, at a quarter-past six, adjourned till the evening.

In the evening sederunt, the dissent and complaint of Mr. Ranald Macpherson, of St. Luke's, against the judgment of the Synod of Lothian and Tweeddale, in regard to the "innovations" in old Greyfriars', was taken up, and, after due hearing of parties, dismissed.

THURSDAY, June 25.

The Assembly resumed on Thursday, at twelve o'clock—Dr. Macfarlane, Moderator.

THE HOME MISSION.

Professor Crawford read the report of the Home Mission Committee, from which we make the following extracts:—

The Church-door collections have amounted to £3750 11s. being £311 14s 6d above those of the previous year, and £272 12s 10d above the average collections of the previous ten years. The contributions from parochial, congregational and missionary associations have amounted to £82 19s 9d, being less than those of the previous year