

doing the work of Voluntaries, in erecting chapels in every part of the country which were soon supplied with ministers, and supported by the free and liberal contributions of the people. Excepting therefore, their continued opposition to additional endowments, of which there was now little or no expectation, Dissenters, from an amiable feeling of delicacy, refrained from publicly advocating their principles, as it might appear harsh and unseemly to do so, with the same eagerness as formerly, amidst the embarrassments with which the non-intrusionists were surrounded, and especially when the tendency of measures in the Establishment was so much in the right direction. This Christian spirit seems to have been appreciated, in some degree by the non-intrusionists themselves; and, therefore, they looked with a more friendly eye towards their dissenting brethren, and expressed something like a desire for their co operation. The great controversy of the day was now, in 1841, much intermingled with political matters; and the agitation between churchmen and dissenters was likely to have its influence in an approaching election of members for Parliament. Several important pamphlets were written as to the question of duty in these circumstances, and especially how far dissenters could consistently support such candidates as the non-intrusionists would wish to return. Among others Dr. Brown of Edinburgh published a tract showing the impossibility of the dissenters consistently co-operating with electors in the Establishment who wished to secure such as would advocate the cause of non-intrusion and independence,* since these were demanded by churchmen on grounds and for objects, with which Dissenters could have no sympathy. The Central Board published an address for vindicating the rights of Dissenters, in which the principles of Dr. Brown were homologated and enforced.

"On the other hand," says Dr. Heugh's biographer, "those able and earnest christian men who were then pressing their views of non-intrusion and independence, by giving a supremacy to the will of the church, over that of the patron, in the settlement of pastors, held it to be a narrow and invidious not to say an unprincipled procedure, for Dissenters to refuse a helping hand to measures of reform, confessedly in the direction of their own principles. The question with Dissenters was one of considerable delicacy; this arose partly, but not chiefly, from the fact that it involved the proposal of aiding one party in the church against another. The one of these parties they viewed as acting most in accordance with the spirit of the New Testament; the other as most in harmony with the genius of a National Establishment, and with the terms of that covenant by which the church and the civil government were bound to one another. It appeared, to persons who did not consider the matter in all its bearings, to be inexplicable, that those who enjoyed ecclesiastical independence, should seem to decline aiding others in their efforts to acquire it. In these circumstances the procedure of Dissenters was peculiarly liable to misapprehension. They had, as they justly contended, sufficiently demonstrated their repugnance to patronage, to the intrusion of ministers on congregations, and to all ecclesiastical dependence on the civil power, and had shown in what way these evils could, as they believed be most effectually avoided. Immediately after they had given forth a declaration to this effect in an official publication, 'A Friendly Address to the Dissenters of Scotland, by ministers of the Established Church' was put into extensive circulation. The result was an amicable controversy, the 'Friendly Address' being followed by 'A Friendly Reply from Dissenting ministers,' and this by a 'Second Friendly Address' and a 'Second Friendly Reply.' It had been well for the cause of charity if the whole controversy on the question of Establishments had been conducted in that spirit of manly candour and Christian forbearance which distinguished these brief publications. The Addresses, it was well known, were from the hand of one who held no second place of influence in the management of those

* That is the right which, in the view of some, an Established Church has to be independent of State supervision.