

ish schools were an integral part of the ecclesiastical body, and the Free Church, which had assumed a somewhat different position from other dissenting bodies in constituting itself not as a congregational but as a territorial Church, had felt it to be a necessary part of their economy to institute a school in connection with each parish church. And what course had they taken with their school? Was it a matter of indifference with them to what Church the schoolmaster belonged? Had they not by the strictest regulations taken care that no one should teach in them but *bona fide* members of their own communion? And for this he blamed them not; he thought they were right, but he claimed the same privilege for the Established Church. (Hear, hear.) A misapprehension seemed to exist that the same arguments against requiring tests in the Universities applied to requiring tests in the Schools. He agreed with Mr. McLeod in his comparison of the schoolmaster with the Professor of Divinity. Where religion was of necessity to be taught, they must have some standard by which to judge of the teacher's religion. He had heard with great satisfaction the statement made yesterday by the minister of Tain, because great stress had been laid on the particular district of Easter Ross, where at the Disruption a large proportion of the Clergy left the Church, carrying with them nearly the whole of their Congregations with the parish schoolmasters. They had been told too that in that district the clerical denunciations of the Free Church had deterred many from coming to the parish schools. He trusted that any minister that had so acted did not carry with him the sympathy of the leaders of the Free Church. He could not conceive why those who were loudest in denouncing priestly domination should themselves set so bad an example. It was a matter of great satisfaction to learn that in these districts the parish schools were again gathering the scholars they lost at the Disruption, and even going beyond the number of scholars they had previous to that time. He for one looked with no jealousy on the exertions of the Free Church in the cause of Education. They owed them a debt of obligation for in many places supplying the deficiencies in education that existed. He only trusted that the time had arrived when Ephraim would not envy Judah, and he also trusted that Judah would not envy Ephraim. (Cheers.) Inspection had been laid down as a necessary concomitant and condition of grants by Government in the way of Education whether in England or in Scotland. This Church had expressed her determination to maintain unimpaired the connection between the parish church and the parish school. Now, if he thought the additional inspection would in the slightest degree impair the authority of the Church Courts in this matter, he would never agree to it, but he was quite willing to agree to inspection on the principles on which the Church had willingly admitted it for the last five years, namely, that the duty of the inspector should be limited to examination and to reporting on the state of the schools visited by him, no power being given to him of interfering with the internal management and still less with the religious education given in the schools. And why was some expression of the mind of the Church now necessary on this subject? Because very different powers were given to the inspectors under the late Bill. He thought, if there were any evils likely to accrue to the Church from the Government inspection, those evils had been reduced, by the regulations which had been adopted for the last five years, to the minimum. Inspection was stated by Government as a *sine qua non*, so that without inspection the Church could get no public aid for her

schools. He had not the smallest doubt that, if any such measure should be again proposed to Parliament which should propose an inspection such as militated against the great principles laid down in the Declaration which had been referred to, the great bulk of the landowners of Scotland would say that they would not accept the grants offered on these terms, but would, out of their own means, provide adequate salaries for the schoolmasters. But, if grants were to be refused merely because they would not submit to inspection of a reasonable kind, how could they expect to carry the sympathies of the heritors along with them?

Mr. Phin then replied. Great benefits, they had been told, would result from Government inspection of the schools. Now his motion did not condemn inspection, and no gentleman in voting for it would be precluded from accepting Government inspection. All he said was, that he did not think it proper to go to Government and say that this Church was ready to accept inspection. Let the Government bring forward its measure, and then they would be prepared to say what they would do. He held that the Church had suffered much from the yielding and temporising policy it had hitherto pursued. If Government insisted on the right of inspection of the parish schools in granting them aid, he knew of no principle on which they could refuse to accept inspection for the 120 parish churches towards the stipends of whose ministers the aid was granted from the Consolidation Fund. It was not correct to say that Government had no inspectors of the parish schools. It had its own qualified and recognised Inspectors in the ministers and elders constituting the Presbyteries of the Church. He vindicated the terms of his resolutions, which, he said, were such as no one present would disapprove of, and were the only resolutions before the House that could secure unanimity. He warned the Assembly against yielding to the current and against further following out the policy of the disastrous resolutions of 1849, and expressed his willingness even to stand alone in resisting the innovations which were sanctioned by the Resolutions of Dr. Graham.

Dr Cook expressed his willingness, on receiving the explanations that had been given of the Resolutions, to withdraw the alterations which had been proposed.

The vote was then taken on the two motions with the following result:—

For Dr. Graham's Resolutions,	221
For Mr Phin's	31
Majority,	190

The Assembly then adjourned till the evening.

EVENING SEDERUNT.

The Assembly met at 8 o'clock, the Moderator in the Chair.

THE LANGHOLM CASE.

This case came before the Assembly by appeals on the part of the presentee to the parish, Mr M'Turk, from certain judgements of the Presbytery of Langholm, finding relevant the objections taken to his settlement by 5 members of the congregation. The presentation was made from the Crown at the close of last year, and the call to the presentee was signed by upwards of 200 of the communicants, but objections were taken against him by several parties, on the ground—1st, That his style of preaching was not adapted for such a large and intelligent population. 2d, That his manner in the pulpit was not very becoming. 3d, That his discourses were partial and unconnected. 4th, That his prayers were desultory and unimpressive. 5th, That his ordinary department was reckless, and occasionally incorrect. And, 6th, That he had used undue means to obtain signatures to his call. The Presbytery had at first postponed the consideration of these objections, but at their meeting on the 11th May had held them relevant, against

which resolution Mr M'Turk took his appeal. A petition was also laid on the Table from the callers to the presentee, urging on the House to make a speedy settlement of the case.

Parties having been removed,

Dr Hill expressed his opinion that some of the objections were irrelevant, while others, particularly the 2d and 3d, although relevant in their nature, were not so when urged only by a few individuals against the almost unanimous sense of the congregation. He moved that they sustain the appeal, repel the objections, and order the Presbytery to proceed with the trials of the presentee on Tuesday, June 6th, and, should anything occur to delay the settlement, direct the Presbytery to appear before the next meeting of Commission, who should have power finally to dispose of the case.

Mr. JOHN COOK, W. S., held that some of the objections were relevant, though he thought that the Presbytery had been guilty of irregularity in the course of the proceedings. He moved that the relevancy of the 2nd and 3rd objections be sustained.

After some discussion it was agreed to negative Mr. Cook's motion, when that of Dr. Hill was adopted as the deliverance of the House.

CASE OF THE SYNOD OF ORKNEY.

The Assembly took up the case of the Rev. Mr. Aitchison, of the Presbytery of North Isles, which came before them by a dissent and complaint against a sentence of the Synod of Orkney. The subject matter seemed of a very extraordinary character. It appeared that Mr Keillor had inaccurately stated to a wandering pedlar, whose child he was asked to baptise, that the Presbytery had not granted him permission to do so. Mr Keillor had mentioned the matter to his brethren when met as a Presbytery, but had not brought it before the Court as a part of its business. In consequence of his saying to the pedlar that the Presbytery had not granted him permission instead of the brethren, Mr. A. charged him with uttering a wilful falsehood, and brought the matter as a case to be dealt with by the Presbytery. After examining into the facts, the Presbytery decided that Mr. K. had not been guilty of falsehood, but only of a blunder, and for which they directed that he should be admonished. Against this finding Mr. A. appealed to the Synod on the ground that Mr. K. had been guilty of scandal and sin, and ought to be deposed *ab officio*, and subjected to public penance in the parish church. The Synod unanimously dismissed the appeal with a strong expression of their disapprobation of the spirit evinced by Mr A., and completely vindicating Mr. K. from any blame whatever.

After hearing parties, Dr. Cook moved the sentence of the House. As to the merits of the case, he did not think that Mr. K. had been guilty of any offence whatever. On the contrary, in saying that he had submitted the pedlar's case to the Presbytery, he had in fact done so, although not in a technical way. It was preposterous to say that he had told an untruth. After animadverting on the language used by Mr. A., he moved that the Assembly sustain the sentence of the Synod, find that the charge of Mr. A. was unfounded, and that his conduct was most uncharitable in spirit, and his language and manner most unwarrantable; instruct the deliverance to be read in the presence of the Courts both of the Presbytery and the Synod by the Moderator. There was only one thing he regretted, and that was, that he could not accompany this sentence with a decree of costs in favour of Mr. K.

Dr. Robertson, Principal Lee, and various other members concurred in these sentiments. It was proposed to expunge all record of the charge from the books of Presbytery, but this was not found expedient. Ultimately the motion of Dr. Cook was unanimously adopted with the addition that the Presbytery were enjoined not to follow out any sentence of admonition.

The Assembly then adjourned.

(To be continued.)