

were some circumstances, especially in the history of the Church of Scotland in those days, which he thought very interestingly brought this out; and in a very elaborate manner the Professor illustrated the point.

Dr. Marshall Lang, Glasgow, thought there were deeper issues involved than merely touching the surface in their confessions; there was the whole question as to the authority and place of the Bible, and behind that the whole question of the supernatural; and he did not think they could deal with this matter at all effectively unless they dealt with it in a spirit of deep responsibility, intense earnestness, and thorough understanding of the whole question relating to the theology of the Roman Churches. Further, they must remember that, as there was a harmony of the Reformed confessions in the sixteenth century, so there was also to be considered the harmony of the Reformed Churches in the nineteenth century; and there was a mighty responsibility resting upon any Church or body of Christians which, by its own denominational action, would break upon this harmony, or so act as not to keep the unity of Christendom as the higher thought ever in remembrance.

A motion was made by Mr. Taylor Innes, advocate, Edinburgh, to remit the whole subject to a committee to obtain information.

Principal Tulloch, St. Andrews, seconded the motion. They could never, he thought, remit to any committee to draw out a new creed, or even formulate a consensus of all creeds without their being fully informed about those creeds. Now it appeared to him that this information, which was what they were to obtain if the motion was adopted, was exactly what they needed. Nothing could be more interesting than that they should know what were the actual creeds of all the Churches composing the Council.

After a few playful remarks from Dr.

Begg and Dr. Ormiston, the motion was adopted.

Dr. Goold presided at the afternoon meeting, at which a paper was read by Professor Cairns, Edinburgh, on

GENERAL PRINCIPLES OF PRESBYTERIANISM, AND ITS RELATION TO THE WANTS OF THE DAY.

After alluding to the primary points on which all Churches were agreed, such as the need for a creed and the rules of discipline, the Rev. Professor proceeded to indicate the views which separated Presbyterians from Episcopalians. First, he said, they differed in principle from Episcopalians in holding that there was a variety among the governors of the Christian Church. No Episcopalian needed to be convinced that a teacher in the Church was also a ruler—what he required to be convinced of was that others who were not teachers might also be rulers. No doubt, they were now seeing great approximations made to Presbyterian principles in this direction by Episcopalians; but still, it was distinctive and characteristic of Presbyterianism, that it alone contended on principle that there should be this variety. So important was this doctrine to him, that if it were taken away, he should, he confessed, have but little heart to plead for the equality of Presbyter and Bishop. While circumstances had hindered the Continental Churches from fully developing this principle, the Churches in Britain, America, and the colonies had fully recognized it; and thus their brethren from the Continent, who were members of the Council, might see the success which had attended the working of this part of their system, and might go home strengthened and encouraged to give more prominence in future to the principle than they had been able to do in the past. The other point on which they were separated from Episcopalians had reference to equality of power in the government of the Church