

prepared to their conviction. Nevertheless Scotland was strengthened its role. When "at the people's church, making a practice of Scotland matter how without her being been approved or Synod and women, signed the king's Church. the people then a Stuart religious matter this point.

Now it was Knox, representing the people, resisting the Queen and the nobles. Then it was Andrew Melville, representing the people, resisting the episcopacy, but in every case it was the people resisting the encroachments of the State upon their right to think and judge for themselves in religious matters.

My historical ramblings so far have been of a religious character, or, to change the simile, I have been considering the warp of Scotland's history. What kind of woof was the active shuttle of political life weaving into this wondrous democratic web? The growth of Presbyterianism in Scotland stimulated the growth of Puritanism in England, and both made common cause against the tyranny of the Stuart kings. Then followed the defeat of Charles I., his execution at Whitehall, and the triumph of democracy under the Protectorate. Then came the revolution of 1688 by which the responsibility of the King to the House of Commons, that is to the people, was fully guaranteed. One hundred years later and a new empire with the