

may claim sympathy for this meeting on far wider grounds than these—namely, on the ground that all those divisions in the Presbyterian Church of Scotland may, if possible, be somehow healed. I do believe that a movement like that for which we are met this evening is calculated more, perhaps, than any other to heal up those differences, and bring the Churches together to united action, which, I feel satisfied in my own mind, would tend more than anything else could well do to the uplifting of our countrymen, and most especially the uplifting of the masses in our great towns of Scotland. (Applause.) It is not for me, however, to bring the question before you except in its very general aspect, but I venture to say that this movement is, I believe, destined to go on, to grow from the point at which it has arrived now until we bring the whole people of Scotland to the one unanimous opinion that the Presbyterian Church in Scotland is the Church of Scotland, and that, however much we may be divided now, our interests are one and the same throughout. (Applause.) And, speaking as a citizen of Glasgow, I feel that we want now, more than we ever did in this city or in Scotland, something of a territorial supervision of our people—that there shall be no class left unlooked after, that we shall not have masses of people growing up around us of whom we know nothing.”

Mr. A. Orr Ewing, M. P., moved the first resolution, and said what made him come forward on the occasion was that he had heard it alleged that the movement was a clerical one; and that he felt it his duty “as a layman, and as a most ardent admirer and member of the Church of Scotland,” to do his best to rebut so stupid a statement. He showed that patronage had been the cause of all the considerable secessions from the Church; and that apart from that one source, the churches that had dissented from her had had much more trouble with the Civil Courts than ever she had, while they were also much more given to subdivision among themselves. Col. Campbell, of

Blythswood, seconded the resolution, cause “he was sure that if carried into effect it would be a means of sustaining the Church of Scotland which he so dearly loved,” and the Rev. Dr. Gillan, Inchinnan, “thirded” it in a most eloquent speech. He said truly that the present agitation was clerical, it was certainly the most unselfish enterprise ever entered on.

Mr. James Baird, of Auchmearn, next moved “that there should be a measure passed that would give Communicants in each parish a prevailing voice in the selection of their minister.” “He could not state the terms of the measure which was to be proposed as a substitute for patronage; but he might state generally that a board should be elected in every parish; that a certain number of persons should be elected in every congregation that came under the act. Two-thirds of that board were to be elected by the congregation, and one-third by the heritors. One-third of the board elected by the congregation were to retire annually, and they might either be re-elected, or others might be elected in their stead. Those elected by the heritors were to remain longer in office. He hoped the very election of this board would in itself do good. It would bring the congregation together once a year, and would put an end to that deadness and stagnation that so prevailed in some parishes about Church matters.”

Professor Charteris, in seconding the resolution, repudiated the idea that laymen not Communicants of the Church were worthy to appoint its ministers, and he rebuked those unchristian characters, who would fain interfere with progress or reforms of any Church of Christ; and sketched broadly and vigorously the ecclesiastical arrangements that would yet, he hoped, be made in Scotland.

He said: “At an Edinburgh meeting about Church-rates the other day a minister, who cultivates the reputation of a genial and kindly man, spoke of the Church of Scotland as a drowning