

was no recognition in it of such a thing as a priest, in the sacerdotal sense. Presbyterian polity was the cradle of toleration; it had always been the bulwark of liberty; and he did not know a better test for the efficiency and purity of a church than this. A church that was the enemy of toleration, that was the handmaid and companion of political oppression, he did not think could be any possibility be an Apostolic Church. Under Presbyterianism a man depended on no one, and that feeling had given a manly spirit of independence to the Presbyterian population in this and all other countries where it had been allowed free scope.

Dr. Hoge, Richmond, delivered an address on the "Simplicity and Scriptural Character of Presbyterianism, its expansiveness and adaptation, and its friendly aspect to other Evangelical Churches."

The Rev. Mr. Henderson, Ballarat, said Presbyterianism was adapted to the wants of a new country like Australia and New Zealand, and it had done good work there.

Dr. Ormiston, Reformed Dutch Church, New York, confirmed what had been said as to the expansibility and adaption of the Presbyterian system. It was with sorrow he had heard it said in good old Scotland that the Shorter Catechism, which was prepared expressly for those of weaker understanding, was not fit for a child. He told them it was; he knew it, because he had tried it, having been reared on oat-cakes and the Catechism on the banks of the Clyde. That form of sound words was like the good pease-bannock he remembered in his early days, which could be kicked from one end of the house to the other without being spoiled: they might trample on it as they pleased; and when his friends were able to do what he could once do—begin either at the middle, the beginning, or the end of the Catechism—they should find that the book was one which gave light to the understanding

and joy to the heart, and which, if it was used there, was a power in the pulpit.

Dr. Fraser, London, said that while concurring in the views that had been previously expressed, he wished to be allowed to state that he had been a little surprised and chagrined at the compliments paid to the Council by those outside, and who said that, after all, it was not supposed that Presbyterianism was synonymous with Christianity. How, he asked, had it entered into men's minds that Presbyterians entertained such a notion as that? It had never been in their thoughts to arrogate to themselves a position of exclusive dignity and favor, to the disparagement of those of their fellow Christians who were organized under ministrations different from their own. So long as they did not give countenance to the superficial, and often mischievous, notion that it was of no consequence to what section of the Christian Church a man belonged so long as he himself was a genuine Christian, he did not think they could not cure and heal, in frets and divisions and discords of Christian society by as much co-operation as was possible, not merely with fellow Presbyterians, but with fellow Christians, in the enterprises of Christian righteousness and love which were open to them in an informal and extra-ecclesiastical Christian union.

Dr. Macgregor, Edinburgh, after stating that he believed it quite possible to make a great deal too much of their Presbyterian principles, said that, nevertheless, all this talk about their principles was needed, which position he illustrated by a variety of examples.

The meeting closed with thanks to the chairman.

EDINBURGH, July 11th, 1877.

At the re-assembling of the Council on Monday morning, after some preliminary matters had been disposed of, a paper was read by Dr. Patton, of Chicago, on

"THE UNBELIEF OF THE PRESENT DAY."

In undertaking to explain why men did not believe they must be careful lest, in referring to