

ment. They broke up schools and schemes of benevolence—
 “missionary societies, foreign and domestic—prayer meetings—
 “because they would not associate with any who advocated the
 “voluntary principle. And now that they are the Free Church
 “dissenters, they will hold no religious association with those who
 “belong to an establishment. They refuse to meet with them upon
 “the same platform, and to advocate the cause of the London Mis-
 “sionary Society. They will give no assistance to a series of public
 “lectures for the intellectual and moral improvement of young men,
 “if the list of lecturers be tainted by the addition of a single name
 “of an established minister. Nay, an instance came under our obser-
 “vation a short time ago, of a Free Church minister refusing to pray
 “at a funeral, solely because an established minister was requested
 “to officiate at one of the services. Free Church sectarianism is
 “throwing all our catholic societies into derangement, and in every
 “proposed public movement for good, one of the first questions
 “started is this: ‘Will the Free Church go along with you, if you
 “invite Christian men of every denomination to co-operate with
 “you in your benevolent scheme?’ ”

It has been necessary to enter into these details in order to show the composition of the non-intrusion party, that the motives for taking the stand they did may be understood, and also to explain the apparent sacrifice of their livings made by many who in reality sacrificed only a nominal position. The extracts from the organ of the dissenting body, which would naturally have sympathised with the latest seceders from the Church of Scotland, will show the tone and temper displayed by them in their intercourse with their brethren, and will enable some, at least, to see clearly the violent temper displayed and the reason for the little success which attended the efforts of those who counselled moderation. Many attendant circumstances arose which served to distract attention from the real question at issue. In reality the whole dispute was involved in the two points I have named, namely, the enactment of the Veto Law and the assumption of power to give seats in the Church Courts to an indefinite number of men, who legally had no such right. Other questions no doubt branched out from these,