

church in spiritual matters—once familiar, as Bishop Burnet tells us, familiar as household words in the mouths of the peasantry of our land, has faded in the quiet of centuries, and has fallen from the memories, the feelings, and even the understandings of men. From 1638 to 1838—from the Revolution settlement to the time when the court of session came forth with an interdict against the presbytery of Dunkeld in the case of Lethendy, no living power whatever attempted to interfere with any steps of our ecclesiastical proceedings—(hear, hear, hear)—or to meddle with our establishment in aught but the temporalities. It was the disturbance given them which roused the church, and which will at length rouse the nation from its dormancy. (Loud cries of hear, hear.) It was when for the first time those elementary questions which we thought were in the days of our great-grandfathers settled and set by, were conjured and stirred up again, that our minds were gradually opened to the truth; and I doubt not that the agitation of this controversy at the present period, will flash more vividly and more convincingly the same truth into the understandings of the community. Our ark is in the midst of the conflicting billows, but our flag is the more unfurled by the storm which has been raised; and being now spread abroad and expanded by the gale, it only serves to make the motto of our establishment, the more patent to all eyes—the Lord Jesus is the only King and Head of our church. We have nailed that color to the mast—(loud cheers)—and we will keep by it in all its fortunes, whether in the tempest or in the sunshine. Here is our rallying cry, that the Lord Jesus Christ is the only King and Head of the Church of Scotland—this is the watchword of the party with whom I act, and the other side of the House reiterates the cry. Yes, I observe, that many, perhaps all. (Loud and general cries of all.) Well, Moderator, does not this justify me in the distinction which I have made between these two questions—the question of spiritual independence and the question of the veto. The only other distinction which remains between us and the opposite party—after a response so cheering as that we have now heard—the only distinction existing between us, is that which obtains between a declaratory and an effective proposition. (Laughter.) You will only join in a declaratory—would you join in an effective proposition—would you assent by deeds as well as words—the great principles for which we stand by—the veto being put aside—would be gained—the liberty of the Church would be saved—there would be no defeat—no surrender. (Loud cheers.) It is a principle for which we can never expect success by enlisting on our side the understandings of Englishmen. That I despair of. (Hear, hear.) The subject is as distinct from their minds as is the subject matter of the establishments themselves—the one being formed on the pr in-

ciple that the king is the head of the church—the other on the principle that Christ is the head of the church; and the same irreconcilable difference as to the authority over the church obtains in their constitutions, the one being framed according to Hooker, on the principle that there is one government, ecclesiastical and political; the other according to Gillespie and others, according to the conception of the Westminster Confession of Faith, that there are two governments, with distinct heads and distinct office-bearers, each co-extensive with the other in their local standing over the same territory, without conflict, and without confusion, because of the entirely separate department in which they operate—the one having to do with the affairs of the secular, the other with the affairs of the spiritual kingdom. I shall not expatiate on the profound and justly philosophic conception of this idea; but the statement is sufficient to show how practically impossible it is—how utterly hopeless to inculcate with these views the minds of the members of the two Houses of Parliament, for there are not ten—nay, I believe there not three—of those members who would vindicate those principles for which we contend. (Hear.) They are principles for which they have on taste and no comprehension; our very phraseology, as was seen in the late discussion in the Senate House, falls upon the English ear like the jargon of some outlandish province, or the outpouring of the unknown tongues. (Laughter.) But it is not to the intelligence of England in this matter that we specially address ourselves—we appeal rather to the Legislative wisdom of England—to that wisdom which, without the knowledge, and what is more, without approving of our Presbyterian constitution, consented at first to tolerate a Presbyterian establishment at all, in the reign of William and Mary. (Hear, hear.) We appeal to them now not to destroy their own work—not to lift up their hands with violence against our Scriptural and Protestant Church, which is now engaged in dispensing innumerable blessings, and especially not in the face of the resolved and nearly unanimous demand of the people of Scotland. I do not mean to say that this conduct of the Legislature, in endowing the Church, not because they were satisfied of its being a true Church, but because the people demand it—I do not mean to say that is a correct principle—for instance it would not be right, on the same principle, to endow Popery in Ireland; but ours is a Scripture Protestant Church, and within that limit, it is open to Parliament to endow or refuse to endow. The rev. Doctor went on at great length, which we are not able to follow out in time for this publication, to show that the Church was perfectly able to manage her own affairs if she were protected from the encroachments of the civil courts; and after showing the uselessness of Lord Aberdeen's bill for this purpose, and reading a large correspondence with him on the