

Technical and Bibliographic Notes / Notes techniques et bibliographiques

The Institute has attempted to obtain the best original copy available for filming. Features of this copy which may be bibliographically unique, which may alter any of the images in the reproduction, or which may significantly change the usual method of filming, are checked below.

L'Institut a microfilmé le meilleur exemplaire qu'il lui a été possible de se procurer. Les détails de cet exemplaire qui sont peut-être uniques du point de vue bibliographique, qui peuvent modifier une image reproduite, ou qui peuvent exiger une modification dans la méthode normale de filmage sont indiqués ci-dessous.

Coloured covers/  
Couverture de couleur

Coloured pages/  
Pages de couleur

Covers damaged/  
Couverture endommagée

Pages damaged/  
Pages endommagées

Covers restored and/or laminated/  
Couverture restaurée et/ou pelliculée

Pages restored and/or laminated/  
Pages restaurées et/ou pelliculées

Cover title missing/  
Le titre de couverture manque

Pages discoloured, stained or foxed/  
Pages décolorées, tachetées ou piquées

Coloured maps/  
Cartes géographiques en couleur

Pages detached/  
Pages détachées

Coloured ink (i.e. other than blue or black)!  
Encre de couleur (i.e. autre que bleue ou noire)

Showthrough/  
Transparence

Coloured plates and/or illustrations/  
Planches et/ou illustrations en couleur

Quality of print varies/  
Qualité inégale de l'impression

Bound with other material/  
Relié avec d'autres documents

Continuous pagination/  
Pagination continue

Tight binding may cause shadows or distortion along interior margin/  
La reliure serrée peut causer de l'ombre ou de la distorsion le long de la marge intérieure

Includes index(es)/  
Comprend un (des) index

Title on header taken from: /  
Le titre de l'en-tête provient:

Blank leaves added during restoration may appear within the text. Whenever possible, these have been omitted from filming/  
Il se peut que certaines pages blanches ajoutées lors d'une restauration apparaissent dans le texte, mais, lorsque cela était possible, ces pages n'ont pas été filmées.

Title page of issue/  
Page de titre de la livraison

Caption of issue/  
Titre de départ de la livraison

Masthead/  
Générique (périodiques) de la livraison

Additional comments: /  
Commentaires supplémentaires:

This item is filmed at the reduction ratio checked below /  
Ce document est filmé au taux de réduction indiqué ci-dessous.

10x	14x	18x	22x	26x	30x
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
12x	16x	20x	24x	28x	32x

# THE PRESBYTERIAN.

AUGUST, 1869.

F any inducement beyond those already held out were necessary to urge forward the speedy endowment of Queen's College, it is the want of ministers to supply the pulpits now vacant. As far as we can see there are sixteen charges, several of these having more than one station, which are destitute of supply, except such fitful and intermittent help as can be afforded by missionaries and catechists. Even these are not always to be had, and the danger is that many of our people will grow up regardless of the Word of God, careless of ordinances and ready to fall a prey to the various forms of error which are so frequently presented to them. It is impossible to regard this state of things without sad forebodings. Much as we love our own Church, greatly as we desire to see her grow and increase, and earnestly as we long for the time when her ministers shall be able to attend to the wants, and care for the spiritual interests of many thousands and tens of thousands throughout the land, yet under the present circumstances we would welcome every effort made by those who preach Christ and Him crucified, even although they may differ from us on various points of Church government. And when we say so, it must not be supposed that we approve of the fanatical, ill-directed zeal of well meaning but ignorant men who go about to establish a religion of their own, and who have done and are doing harm to the cause which we believe they fancy they are serving. It is rather to prevent the spread of the errors which these men are engaged in disseminating, and to counteract their efforts in localities in which they have gained a footing, that we would welcome efficient aid. Were there, then, ministers of evangelical denominations working in the localities in which the vacant charges of our Church are to be

found, bad as the case might be for the progress of our Church, there would yet be the consolation that at least the people were not destitute of ordinances, nor compelled to resort to fountains of error to seek to slake their thirst for the water of life. But many of the districts in which our charges are vacant, have been occupied by us alone, and the congregations have been gathered with much labour and prayer, and kept together only by sacrifices of comfort and even of health which those who enter into the comparative ease of long settled charges cannot realise, nor fully understand. Some of these have overcome the first difficulties incident to the formation of congregations in thinly peopled settlements. The indifference, the coldness, the confirmed habit of not attending religious service, the neglect of family prayer, the want of personal religion, the desecration of the Lord's Day, the various evil habits contracted under such circumstances, have all to be overcome before any progress can be made. Such work has to be done and has been done, but how long can the influence brought to bear by the regular ministration of the Word, continued for a few years, be expected to continue after the charge has been left vacant, and the sound of the Gospel is no longer heard, or heard only at irregular intervals, while there is no pastoral supervision, and no one to go out and in among the people to break to them the bread of life? It is this, independent altogether of our position as a Church, which makes the contemplation of these unfilled vacancies one of so painful a nature. Some of the congregations have been destitute of regular ministrations for a considerable time, not from any disinclination on the part of the people to give a call, or to provide a fair support for their pastor, but from the utter impossibility of their obtaining a minister, there not being a sufficient number to supply the demand. There have of

# THE PRESBYTERIAN.

AUGUST, 1869.

F any inducement beyond those already held out were necessary to urge forward the speedy endowment of Queen's College, it is the want of ministers to supply the pulpits now vacant. As far as we can see there are sixteen charges, several of these having more than one station, which are destitute of supply, except such fitful and intermittent help as can be afforded by missionaries and catechists. Even these are not always to be had, and the danger is that many of our people will grow up regardless of the Word of God, careless of ordinances and ready to fall a prey to the various forms of error which are so frequently presented to them. It is impossible to regard this state of things without sad forebodings. Much as we love our own Church, greatly as we desire to see her grow and increase, and earnestly as we long for the time when her ministers shall be able to attend to the wants, and care for the spiritual interests of many thousands and tens of thousands throughout the land, yet under the present circumstances we would welcome every effort made by those who preach Christ and Him crucified, even although they may differ from us on various points of Church government. And when we say so, it must not be supposed that we approve of the fanatical, ill-directed zeal of well meaning but ignorant men who go about to establish a religion of their own, and who have done and are doing harm to the cause which we believe they fancy they are serving. It is rather to prevent the spread of the errors which these men are engaged in disseminating, and to counteract their efforts in localities in which they have gained a footing, that we would welcome efficient aid. Were there, then, ministers of evangelical denominations working in the localities in which the vacant charges of our Church are to be

found, bad as the case might be for the progress of our Church, there would yet be the consolation that at least the people were not destitute of ordinances, nor compelled to resort to fountains of error to seek to slake their thirst for the water of life. But many of the districts in which our charges are vacant, have been occupied by us alone, and the congregations have been gathered with much labour and prayer, and kept together only by sacrifices of comfort and even of health which those who enter into the comparative ease of long settled charges cannot realise, nor fully understand. Some of these have overcome the first difficulties incident to the formation of congregations in thinly peopled settlements. The indifference, the coldness, the confirmed habit of not attending religious service, the neglect of family prayer, the want of personal religion, the desecration of the Lord's Day, the various evil habits contracted under such circumstances, have all to be overcome before any progress can be made. Such work has to be done and has been done, but how long can the influence brought to bear by the regular ministration of the Word, continued for a few years, be expected to continue after the charge has been left vacant, and the sound of the Gospel is no longer heard, or heard only at irregular intervals, while there is no pastoral supervision, and no one to go out and in among the people to break to them the bread of life? It is this, independent altogether of our position as a Church, which makes the contemplation of these unfilled vacancies one of so painful a nature. Some of the congregations have been destitute of regular ministrations for a considerable time, not from any disinclination on the part of the people to give a call, or to provide a fair support for their pastor, but from the utter impossibility of their obtaining a minister, there not being a sufficient number to supply the demand. There have of

course been changes, but these have merely shifted the evil from one neighbourhood to another, not lessened the number of the vacant pulpits. The matter has become very serious. What remedy can be found for the evil, or how can it be most speedily removed?

The number of students now studying for the Church bears no proportion to the number of ministers yearly required to fill up the blanks caused by deaths and removals, or to provide for the natural increase in the number of charges. The unfortunate circumstances in which the College has been placed for some years, even before the loss of revenue caused by the reduction in value of the Commercial Bank shares, and the withdrawal of the Government Grant, acted prejudicially, there is no doubt, on the interests of the College, and consequently on the interests of the Church. The present movement may, therefore, be expected to have a most beneficial effect, not only by securing an endowment at least equivalent to the loss of revenue, but also by creating a more intelligent interest in the affairs of the College itself. Whatever changes, however, for the better may take place, the improvement must be the work of time while the necessities of the Church are pressing and demand immediate attention. Some more speedy method must be found, but the difficulty is to ascertain what that method should be.

It is evident that a supply of men from the parent Church, cannot be calculated on. It is worse than useless to send those who have been found unsuitable for the work at home. Some of those who came out and returned to Scotland, no doubt to carry back an evil report of the country, had evidently mistaken their vocation, and whatever else they were fit for, were certainly not adapted for ministerial work. Least of all were they suited for the colonies, or qualified to fulfil the active, earnest, untiring, aggressive work, which must be performed in country charges with outlying districts. There are peculiar qualifications wanted for this kind of work and if men are to be sent from home they must possess them and an adaptability which will enable them to suit themselves to the requirements of a new country. It will be difficult to get such men, and those who do not possess such qualifications are not wanted. We call attention to the position in which the Church is placed. We

have presented some of the difficulties to be overcome, and we ask the members of the Church to consider them well. It may be that the presentation of these truths may direct the attention to them of many who have never before thought of the necessity laid upon each one to be up and doing. In the meantime the thoughts and prayers of all should be directed towards the solution of this difficulty, and it is to be hoped the hearts of many of our young men may be directed towards the ministry, that so in the course of a few years labourers may be prepared to work in the harvest field. It does not offer the same temptations as some professions and occupations do; there are not the same worldly advantages to be gained; the same opportunities of acquiring wealth. But there is growing up a truer feeling of the duties of congregations to their pastor; a juster sense of what is due to him for his labours and a more earnest desire to honour him for his Master's sake. And when the work is well done, with the full import of its importance, with the ever present consciousness of the responsibilities of him who has had souls placed under his care, souls to be trained for immortality; children to be led to Christ; fathers to be led child-like to the foot of their Father's throne; there is a peace, a joy, a happiness surpassing those bestowed by riches or honours, however unbounded these may be. To the Church at large, we commend the consideration of this subject, and shall be glad to hear from those who may have suggestions to make. It is time we were roused from our lethargy. For the next few years we will require all the wisdom of all the ablest men in the Church, and we lament that so few should think it their duty to give to their brethren through our columns the benefits of their experience. "No man liveth to himself, no man dieth to himself," yet a cold silence and apparent withdrawal of themselves from every means of communication with their brethren outside of their own congregations is too much the rule among the ministers of our Church. Have they ever reflected on the evil this has wrought or do they consider the loss of efficiency caused by this, more than semi-congregationalism? We urge ministers and members to be more alive to their duties in this respect, and we shall then have a more active Church, a stronger life, a more rapid growth and a more earnest people.

## News of our Church.

**EAST NOTTAWASAGA.**—It was a pleasing duty recently to chronicle the settlement of a minister in Purple Hill and Osprey, formerly a branch of the Nottawasaga congregation. Already information comes of another swarm hiving off from the same congregation to constitute themselves into a separate charge. The new congregation is to be named East Nottawasaga, in contradistinction to the present charge which is henceforth to be called West Nottawasaga. There are already 100 families reckoned in the new charge.

**BUCKINGHAM AND CUMBERLAND.**—On the 7th ult. a call was moderated in favour of the Rev. W. Anderson, at present missionary in Griffiatown, Montreal. The call was unanimous and cordial. The Presbytery of Ottawa sustained the call on the 12th ult. The induction took place on the 20th ult., the Rev. Prof. Ferguson preaching and presiding, Rev. E. Maitan addressing the congregation, and Mr. Canning the minister. This is a settlement, from which, with Mr. Anderson's reputation as a preacher, we augur excellent results.

**TORONTO.**—The accomplished and respected minister of St. Andrew's church, not having enjoyed very good health during the winter and spring, has obtained leave of absence from his charge for a few months, and has gone to Britain to breathe his native air and gain repose. All our readers will wish him a pleasant holiday, and will join in the prayer that he may soon return with renewed vigour.

**CHELSEA AND IRONSIDE.**—The following facts will give a good idea of the position and prospects of this charge, now added to the list of vacancies by the translation of Mr. Sieveright: the church and manse belong to Gilmour & Co., and a large proportion of the revenue of the church is derived from their employés. There is no other Protestant service held at either station. So fluctuating is the population that while during 4 years nearly 50 communicants were added to the roll, the entire communion-membership is now only 40, of whom only 15 were in connection with the church when Mr. Sieveright was settled. The stipend paid by the congregation during the past half year was \$250. The Sabbath school shews 68 scholars on the roll. There is a Sabbath school and congregational library of 500 or 600 volumes, which cost about \$400. At one time the prospect of a large congregation at Ironside was excellent; but the suspension of work at the Hull iron mines has almost annihilated the church there. The average attendance there now is only about 24. Chelsea is 8 miles from Ottawa, and Ironside 5 miles. The country is beautiful, and a Macadamized road leads to the capital.

**ST. GABRIEL CHURCH, MONTREAL.**—The third Quarterly Meeting of the Missionary Association of this Church for the year 1868-9 was held on Wednesday evening, the 7th ult. Considering that it was the spring and early summer quarter the collectors' returns showed scarcely any falling off from the average of the winter quarter,

when all the families are in the city. The total amount collected was \$81.66; of which the following distribution was made by the subscribers:

To the Widow's Fund.....	\$20 04
" " Home Mission.....	21 56
" " French Mission.....	7 56
" " Bursary Fund.....	0 87

leaving \$32.02 to be allocated by the executive committee, who voted \$25 to the Synod's Home Mission Fund, and the balance was carried over to the next quarter.

**OWEN SOUND AND DERBY.**—It is cheering to learn of the prosperity of this congregation, so recently placed on our Synod roll. A new church has been erected in the latter place, a station 5 or 6 miles out of the village, which has been placed at once out of debt through the liberality of the people themselves and aid obtained from the church at large. An effort is to be made to erect a new church the coming autumn in Owen Sound, an improvement much needed, as the present edifice does not afford adequate accommodation. As many as 10 families are now seeking pews but cannot obtain them. Forty-nine communicants were added to the roll last year, and there is promise of an equal number this year.

**PRESBYTERY OF SAUGEEN.**—The Rev. James Kidd, M. A., late minister of Richmond, has been designated by the colonial committee of the church of Scotland to labour in the mission field of this Presbytery, and is expected to enter upon his work during the present month.

**GALT.**—The Rev. Prof. Mowat, of Queen's College, is officiating with his accustomed zeal and with great acceptance to this congregation in the absence of Mr. Muir, who is away on a recruiting cruise to England and Scotland.

**GOBERICH.**—The induction of the Rev. James Sieveright who has been translated from Chelsea to this charge, took place on the 13th ult. The call was very harmonious, and there can be little doubt that the congregation shall continue to prosper under the energetic and zealous labours of a minister who has gained for himself a reputation as a great church-extensionist.

**REV. MR. NICOL.**—His many friends will be glad to learn that Mr. Nicol's health has been quite restored by a residence on the coast for several months, and that there is a strong probability of his returning to resume his labours in Canada, under the auspices of the colonial committee. With so many vacancies to be supplied with ordinations, this will be gratifying intelligence to all who love the prosperity of our Zion.

**REV. MR. JOHNSON.**—We are pleased to learn that Mr. Johnson, barrister, of Owen Sound, who is also a well known and popular clergyman of the church of Scotland in Canada, has so far regained his health by his residence there, that he has determined to resume the duties of his sacred office. We heartily congratulate our learned and reverend friend on his

resolution, and have no doubt that congregations which can appreciate an accomplished and eloquent preacher, will eagerly seek his services. Vacant congregations wishing to communicate with him can hear from him at Owen Sound.

**THREE RIVERS.**—The Presbytery of Quebec met at Three Rivers on June 29 and ordained and inducted the Rev. Jn. Bennett, minister of St. Andrew's Church there. The Rev. Dr. Cook preached and presided. Mr. Bennett is the first minister who has begun and completed, at Morrin College, his education for the ministry. He is a native of Kinross, and has already given good proof of his zeal and ability, he having served the Presbytery of Perth, as a Catechist in the Township of Darling, with much efficiency and success.

**ST. LOUIS DE GONZAGUE.**—The Lord's Supper was dispensed, by order of the Presbytery of Montreal, by one of its members to this congregation on the 27th of June. The little church was full on the occasion, and forty persons communicated.

**QUEEN'S COLLEGE.**

**ENDOWMENT SCHEME.**—Since our last issue, the visitation of congregations has been continued by the deputation from the College with satisfactory results. Subscriptions have been obtained averaging over \$1200 per week. The total amount is now estimated at \$75,000.

*Nelson and Waterdown.*—This charge was visited by one of the deputation during the week beginning 20th June. In Waterdown the subscriptions amount to \$335.50, in Nelson to \$284, which will be increased.

During the same week the other members of the deputation visited

*Milton*, and obtained \$412, also

*Hornby and Trufalgar*, and obtained \$88.50.

*Hamilton.*—The week beginning the 27th June was spent in Hamilton. The members of the deputation officiated in St. Andrew's Church on Sabbath, and held a meeting on the following evening. The amount subscribed is \$1544.50. To this has to be added \$100 from Dr. Bethune of Glanford.

*Thorah.*—The deputation took part in the administration of the Lord's Supper here on the 4th ultimo, and addressed the people in behalf of the scheme after the thanksgiving services on Monday. Over \$600 has been subscribed by eight members of the congregation. We are not in a position to give the total amount, but feel assured from what we have heard, that it will be liberal.

**DONATIONS TO THE LIBRARY:**—Jas. Osborne, Beamsville, 1 vol.; Mrs. Little, Niagara, 1 vol.; Miss Reid, Hamilton, 11 vols.; John L. Morris, Esq., Montreal, 167 vols., Parliamentary documents; Rev. George D. Ferguson, L'Original, 1 vol., (old manuscript); Rev. W. Simpson, Lachine, 1 vol.; John Creighton, Kingston, 1 vol.

**QUEEN'S COLLEGE ENDOWMENT FUND.**

Statements for insertion in the PRESBYTERIAN will be made up here on the 15th of each month.

Local Treasurers and others are particularly requested, when making up their detailed statements of

remittances to the College Treasurer, to follow the mode of entry adopted below.

W. IRELAND, Treasurer.

Queen's College,  
Kingston, Ont., 15th July, 1869. }  
Subscriptions acknowledged to 15th June,  
1869. .... \$27016 58-

**KINGSTON.**

Jas. Minnes, 1st instalment on \$100. \$25 00  
Agnes M. Machar..... 20 00  
Robert White, 1st instalment on  
\$100..... 25 00  
70 00

**TORONTO.**

Local Treasurer, JAS. MITCHELL.  
Mrs. John Cameron, balance..... 20 00

**BROCKVILLE.**

Local Treasurer, GEO. HUTCHESON.  
William Fitzsimons..... 5 00  
James Craunston, 1st instal. on \$5... 2 50  
Charles Byers, 1st " on \$9... 3 00  
David Byers, 1st " on \$6 .. 2 00  
E. Gilmore..... 10 00  
William Martin..... 5 00  
Charles Webster, 1st instal. on \$5... 2 00  
John Page..... 100 00  
Geo. Hutcheson, 1st instal. on \$200. 67 00  
196 50

**NIAGARA.**

Rev. Charles Campbell, 1st instal. on  
\$30..... 10 00  
Rev. David Niven, B.A., 1st instal.  
on \$100..... 20 00  
William Hacker, 1st instal. on \$8... 1 00  
John Rogers..... 2 00  
Cash..... 2 00  
A Friend..... 1 00  
William Scott..... 3 00  
T. M. Rowland..... 5 00  
John McCulloch..... 10 00  
Mrs. William Little..... 5 00  
Jane McFarland..... 10 00  
Marjory McFarland..... 10 00  
James McFarland..... 10 00  
Robert Shearer..... 5 00  
George Dawson, junr. .... 5 00  
Robert Niven..... 5 00  
A. C. Currie..... 10 00  
W. A. F. Currie..... 5 00  
A Friend..... 5 00  
James Carunchan..... 5 00  
Philip A. Cathline..... 4 00  
Louisa Whitlaw..... 4 00  
Benjamin Dawson..... 2 00  
Mrs. Joseph Stevens..... 1 00  
Robert Rogers..... 2 00  
Mrs. Thomas Elliott..... 1 00  
148 00

**CLIFTON.**

John Robertson, 1st instal. on \$20.. 10 00  
Jane S. Chadwick..... 25 00  
Mrs. G. W. Taylor..... 50 00  
Mrs. George Duncan..... 21 00  
James Davidson..... 5 00  
William Bell..... 10 00  
Robert Gunn..... 5 00  
G. R. McMicking..... 10 00  
George Robertson..... 45 00  
Alanson Ross..... 10 00  
James McBain..... 5 00  
196 00

**ST. CATHERINES.**

John McCalla..... 10 00  
W. L. Copeland..... 5 00  
A Friend..... 1 00  
D. W. Beadle, 1st instal. on \$10..... 5 00  
21 00

**WEST GWILLIMBURY.**

Local Treasurer, DONALD FRASER.  
Wm. Sutherland, 1st instal. on \$20.. 6 66  
Donald Ferguson, 1st " on \$15.. 5 00  
Wm. Sutherland, 1st " on \$10.. 3 34  
John Sutherland, 1st " on \$10.. 3 34  
James McKay..... 10 00  
Angus Sutherland..... 1 00  
Rev. W. McKee, 1st instal. on \$9... 3 00  
Mrs. And. McBeth, 1st " on \$15.. 5 00  
J. Dewson, 1st instal. on \$6 ..... 2 00  
S. Symhitt, 1st " on \$5..... 2 00

Andrew Stoddart, 1st inst. on \$5...	1 00
A. Friend, (Bondhead).....	5 00
J. Carswell.....	4 00
B. Manning.....	4 00
Messrs. St. Clair.....	5 00

61 00

MILTON.

Local Treasurer, Judge MILLER.

Adam Sprout, 1st inst. on \$100....	50 00
H. & J. Huxton.....	10 00
William Anderson.....	5 00
H. McCallum.....	20 00
John Dewar, Junr.....	5 00
James Carradice.....	5 00
William Laidlaw.....	10 00
Mrs. Rodden.....	10 00
John White.....	20 00
George Smith.....	2 00

187 00

HORNBY AND TRAFALGAR.

Local Treasurer, Judge MILLER.

Francis Huston.....	10 00
John McMillan.....	5 00
W. G. Kennedy.....	5 00
Ann McCartney.....	5 00
Jacob Brooks.....	1 00
Mrs. James Biggar.....	0 50
George McCartney.....	5 00

31 50

WATERDOWN.

Local Treasurer, JOHN GLASGOW.

W. T. Jones, 1st instal. on \$15.....	5 00
Peter Green, 1st " on \$30.....	15 00
Thomas Little, 1st instal. on \$30.....	15 00
Hugh Green, 1st " on \$40.....	20 00
Mrs. Hall, 1st " on \$4.....	1 00
Joseph Eager.....	5 00
David Brown.....	2 00
Cash.....	1 50
Mrs. Esson.....	1 00
William Reid.....	2 00

67 50

NELSON.

Local Treasurer, PETER McCULLOCH.

Peter McCulloch, 1st instal. on \$100	33 00
Mary McWha, 1st " on \$10.....	5 00
John A. Patton, 1st " on \$15.....	5 00
H. P. Zimmermann, 1st " on \$15.....	5 00
John Gordon, 1st instal. on \$30.....	10 00
James McLaren, B.A., M.D., 1st instal. on \$30.....	10 00
James McKerlie, 1st instal. on \$15.....	5 00
John Marshall, 1st " on \$15.....	5 00
Nathaniel Lamb.....	4 00
Mrs. Cairns.....	2 00
George Foster.....	1 00
Peter Sutor.....	1 00
J. L. Birney.....	10 00

96 00

HAMILTON.

Local Treasurer, Judge LOGIE.

Matthew Leggat.....	100 00
Mrs. G. L. Gillespie.....	100 00
Janie H. Ewing.....	20 00
Archibald E. Malloch, B.A., M.D....	50 00
James Walker.....	40 00
J. Cousins.....	5 00
J. McKay.....	5 00
Robert Hopkin.....	5 00
William Vallance.....	5 00
W. T. Laing.....	2 00
T. McIlwraith.....	5 00
James Inch.....	5 00
A. Friend.....	5 00
W. D. Kennedy.....	2 00
A. Friend.....	4 00
Robert Halston.....	2 00
William Loudon.....	5 00
James Robertson.....	5 00
William Craigie, 1st instal. on \$50..	10 00
H. Munzie, 1st instal. on \$15.....	5 00

Alex. Turner, 1st instal. on \$100....	50 00
R. H. Rae.....	20 00
A. Friend.....	2 00
George Laing, Junr.....	2 00
D. Campbell.....	5 00
Henry Gray.....	2 00
William Ronald.....	5 00
T. S. Hill.....	5 00

471 00

SMITH'S FALLS.

Local Treasurer, — PERCY.

Walter Armstrong, 1st instal. on \$15	5 00
Robert Graham, 1st instal. on \$15...	5 00
A. & J. Livingstone, 1st instal. on \$10.....	5 00
Peter Hunter.....	15 00
Duncan Cameron, 1st instal. on \$10.	3 35
Robert Hunter.....	40 00
Wm. McDonald, 1st instal. on \$50..	20 00
Hugh Ross.....	10 00
H. D. Chalmers, 1st instal. on \$10..	3 00
A. McLean, 1st instal. on \$6 ..	2 00
Dr. Atcheson.....	10 00
John Publou, 1st instal. on \$15.....	5 00
Robert Wilson.....	3 00
Alex. Cameron, 1st instal. on \$8....	2 00
John Hutton, 1st instal. on \$3.....	1 80
A. Brown.....	3 00
R. W. Graham.....	3 00
William Moore.....	1 00
Alex. Condie, senr., and wife.....	4 00
M. S. Currie.....	5 00
James and Thomas Corbitt.....	1 50
Alex. McDonald.....	2 00
Mal. Condie, senr.....	1 50
James McAdam.....	2 00

152 35

SCOTLAND.

Amount collected by Rev. Arch. Walker,	
Revenue.....	100 00

Total..... \$28509 43

HOME MISSION FUND.

St. Matthews, Montreal, per Rev. Josh. Fraser,	\$13.00
North Williamsburgh, per Rev. John Davidson	10.00
Westminster, per Rev. James McEwen.....	17.00
Wawanosh, per Rev. William Barr.....	4.00
Erin, per Rev. Donald Strachan.....	10.00
Laprairie, per Rev. John Barr, (additional)...	5.00
Elden, per Rev. Neil Macdougall.....	10.00
North Emsley, per Rev. William Miller, (ad- ditional).....	3.50
Beckwith, per Rev. Walter Ross, (additional)..	10.00
Peterboro, per Rev. D. J. Macdonnell.....	15.00
An old "friend," in Ramsay.....	30.00

JAMES CROIL, Treasurer.

Morrisburgh, 17th July, 1869.

MINISTER'S WIDOWS' AND ORPHANS' FUND.

Wawanosh, per Rev. Wm. Barr.....	\$5 00
Huntly, " James Sinclair.....	10 00
Lindsay, " Robert Dobie.....	12 00

\$27 00

ARCH. FERGUSON, Treasurer.

Montreal, July 19, 1869.

FRENCH MISSION FUND.

Huntly, per Rev. James Sinclair.....	\$5 00
From an anonymous friend in Ramsay, through J. Croil, Esq.....	10 00
Tossorontio, per Rev. A. Maclearen.....	10 00
Valcartier, " David Shanks.....	4 00
Brock, " Arch. Currie.....	5 00

\$34 00

ARCH. FERGUSON, Treasurer.

Montreal, July 19, 1869.

## Correspondence.

(To the Editor of the Presbyterian.)



IR,—In the last number of the *Presbyterian*, I observed an epitome of the Annual Report of St. Andrew's Church, Ottawa. The report itself is before me; and, in some respects, it is very satisfactory. Since Mr. Croil's admirable report for the year 1866 was printed,—although the number of scholars attending the Sabbath school are exactly the same, there has been an increase of thirteen families and of thirty-seven communicants. The pew rents have been increased since the report of last year by \$83.89; but the ordinary Sabbath day collections appear to be nearly the same, for as noticed by you, they then averaged from \$12 to \$15 each day.

There is another item of income mentioned in the report, and which Mr. Croil stated to have been \$600 in 1866. I mean that arising from the glebe lot. Previous to the passing of an Act of Parliament recently obtained, incorporating the congregation, the Minister of the Church was legally entitled to the proceeds of the glebe, exclusive of the stipend promised by the congregation. For this reason, it was not usual to take any notice of it in the annual reports. I may take leave to say, however, that an important change has been made in this respect. My respected successor is solely dependent on the sum promised to him by the congregation. This I hold to be no improvement so far as the incumbent is concerned. Doubtless the control of the proceeds of the glebe would have been the best security which he could have obtained for the payment of his stipend to a certain extent, and in process of time, situated as the glebe is, the Minister of St. Andrew's Church, Ottawa, might have been in possession of the best endowment in the Dominion of Canada.

You say that the debt of the Church at Ottawa has been reduced during the year, from \$1699.86 to \$1368.21. I regret to have to remark that in making its statement, you, inadvertently, do me injustice. The language would appear to imply that there has been a debt of long standing which is being gradually liquidated. It is true, that when I was inducted Minister of the congregation there was debt on the manse. This, however, was soon afterwards paid; and although during my incum-

bency, both the church and manse were enlarged, a school-room built, and other improvements made, when I resigned my charge, there was no debt whatever. As appears from the report itself, the debt referred to was contracted last year by an outlay in improving the manse, and which has been reduced to the extent you mention out of the proceeds of a bazaar held in 1866. This money was raised for a special purpose, and it is to be hoped that the ladies of the congregation, to whom I was under the greatest obligation for their exertions in connection with many good works, will take care that the money be sacredly reserved for the purpose for which it was intended.

You mention that it is proposed to build a new edifice for the accommodation of the worshippers in St. Andrew's Church. That perhaps would be well. At the same time, church extension in the city ought not to be lost sight of. In 1800 my Kirk Session was at considerable expense in fitting up a room in the East division of the city, and with the help of my assistant, I had one service there each Sabbath. I also opened a station in the village of New Edinburgh which is a suburb of the city—rapidly growing into importance. Afterwards I deemed it advisable to endeavour to obtain a Missionary whose services might be exclusively devoted to the places just mentioned. This matter I brought under the notice of the Presbytery of Ottawa, and that court, approving of what I had done, made application to the Colonial Committee in accordance with my wish. This application was favourably received. A gentleman was nominated for that field of labour; but he, having declined the appointment, the matter is now in abeyance. I am persuaded, however, that another congregation might be gradually formed without materially affecting the interest of St. Andrew's Church. Let the people of Ottawa learn a lesson from Montreal; St. Gabriel's Church has been opened, and is doing well under an energetic and efficient minister, and other congregations have been formed with marked success without affecting the old congregations in that city; on the contrary, St. Andrew's and St. Paul's seem to prosper more and more, and that in the face of all opposition. Or our adherents in Ottawa might learn a lesson from the Canada Presbyterian Church in that city. A new congregation has been organized, and a fine church has been built without diminishing in any sensible degree the numbers who worship in Knox's

Church. The truth is, that unless our adherents bestir themselves in time, the field will be occupied by other denominations. St. Andrew's Church will stand alone, respectable no doubt as a congregation; but still a solitary congregation representing our body, whilst others wiser in their day and generation, are multiplying their places of worship, and drawing away our adherents, enticed, it may be, by no other motives, but than of nearness to their own places of abode. Thus there may be matter for unavailing repentance. But that the adherents of our Church in regard to this matter may obtain that wisdom which is from above, to direct their steps, is the prayer of your obedient servant,

ALEX. SPENCE.

East Neuk, Elgin,  
Scotland, 18th May, 1869.

To the Editor of the Presbyterian.



SIR,—The accompanying letter was first addressed to the *Montreal Evening Telegraph* in reply to a letter which had appeared in that paper signed Watchman, the drift of which may be learned from this reply. Thistle's letter deals with matters in regard to which it is to be feared not a little ignorance prevails among at least the younger generation of Presbyterians. It is quite common, especially with those who affect the *bon ton*, among our young people, to assume that in matters of the kind here spoken of the church of England is right, and we are wrong. It may help to show our people that they have no need to be ashamed of even those things which others sometimes attempt to turn into ridicule, as if indicating ignorance or a want of refinement, to reprint Thistle's letter.

*Nemo me impune lacessit.*

#### PRESBYTERIAN WORSHIP AS COMMONLY PRACTISED DEFENDED.

To the Editor of the Evening Telegraph.

SIR,—It was only on Saturday evening I saw first a letter in the *Evening Telegraph* of 9th July, entitled *Convenience vs. Piety*, and this must be my excuse for not noticing it sooner. The letter while wishing to appear complimentary to one of the Presbyterian churches of this city, contained unwarrantable reflections upon the manner of Presbyterian worship in general. For instance, it would strike any one acquainted with the history of Presbyterianism at once as a very inappropriate insinuation which is contained in the very title of "Watchman's"

letter; while Presbyterians do not attach any value to sacrifices as such, *Convenience* or in other words *Expediency* has never been a favorite element in their creed; and their past record shows that no people have made greater sacrifices of convenience to principle. I take no notice of what "Watchman" says about the effect produced upon him by the tones of the organ in a certain "Established" Presbyterian Church, further than to state that it is a misapprehension, common among Episcopalians, as well as too many Presbyterians, to suppose that the merits of the question as between *Prelacy* and *Presbytery* have any regard to such matters of practice as the employment of instrumental music, kneeling at prayer or the use of a liturgy. "Watchman" not knowing this seems to have been surprized at hearing the peals of a fine organ and a tasteful rendering of music, as if these were tokens of a departure from the principles of Presbytery. Into the historic grounds of dispute between the two ecclesiastical systems these practices I have mentioned never entered at all.

Having made this remark, I do not wish to be thought to concede that Presbyterians should immediately have recourse to organs, and Prayer-books and genuflections. I am prepared, on the contrary, to show that they have good reason for abstaining from these things. "Watchman" has a summary way of disposing of our mode of worship. By a single stroke of his pen he would set Presbyterians down at once as worse than Mahometans, through the use of that very convenient, though not very legitimate, mental operation called *Assumption*. Buckle in his remarkable treatise on *Civilization*, with characteristic insular arrogance, began by assuming that England, in the narrowest sense of the word, was the standard of *Civilization*. In like manner "Watchman" complacently takes for granted that what he has been accustomed to as an Episcopalian determines what is commendable or censurable in the practice of the "Kirk;" as if the Church of England, Minerva like, had leaped into existence from the mind of the Deity fully equipped with its *rubrics*, *surplices*, *apostolical succession* and all. The arrogance of the assumption would be offensive were it not for its simplicity. "Watchman" talks of the "prayer-inviting" tones of the organs in terms which would imply that there must be a lack of devotional feeling on the part of those Christian assemblies that had not an organ to invite them. But I can say that there are churches, yes and "Established" ones too in the city, in which the praises of God are sung with taste and fervency and una-

nimity without any instrumental tonic, the worshippers falling back on a more ancient stimulus than organs, (Ps. 27. 4-6.)

There are three things "Watchman" specially condemns in ordinary Presbyterian practice. There is first the use of the old version of the Psalms. He says they do not suit the organ. That may be; but I fear if this is the case, it is rather a damaging argument against the use of organs. What! the Psalms of David that have been the solace of God's people for upwards of 2000 years to give place to diffuse, common place hymns that will jingle merrily to the organ. I should like to know what kind of "prayer" its "melody" invites to, if it disqualifies for employing in the worship of God those precious lyrics, breathing the very spirit of prayer, which have been found adequate to express the devoutest sentiments and most varied experience of the pious in all ages. But "Watchman" may say, objection is only taken to the Scottish version of the Psalms. Be it so; that version can stand criticism, as, taken as a whole, in spite of occasional ruggedness and difficult terminals, it has been pronounced by competent authorities the purest in point of Saxon, the tersest in point of style, the noblest in point of spirit, and the most faithful in adherence to the original of all translations yet made—preserving better the aroma of the Hebrew, and possessing more of the higher attributes of poetry, than any other version. Byron tried his hand at improving some of them, but in spite of his unrivalled powers of felicitous versification he gave up the task as hopeless; and when Sir Walter Scott was once consulted by members of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland as to the advisability of attempting a new translation, he ("Watchman" will perhaps acknowledge him no mean judge) said "never give up your version of the Psalms; it is the best." The taste for the higher class of poetry is too generally diffused among the Scottish people for them to exchange these "Grave, sweet melodies" for the distended rhymes that so frequently pass for hymns.

But the burden of "Watchman's" fault-finding falls upon the practice of standing at public prayer. The writer has no objections to either Episcopalians or Presbyterians kneeling if they feel so disposed. Presbyterians acknowledge that this is a perfectly scriptural mode, and also that in certain kinds and parts of prayer it is perhaps the most proper posture. But surely "Watchman" is grossly ignorant of the subject he has ventured to write upon, when he would attempt to brand Presbyterians for standing at

prayer as less reverent than heathens or Turks, who prostrate themselves before the Deity. One who professes acquaintance with the East as well as the West, ought to know that in all parts of the globe there is such a thing as standing to do reverence, as well as kneeling. Were Solomon and the people of Israel less devout than a "Barbary Moor?" (1 Kings, 8, 14, 22.) Presbyterians have good reasons for preferring the attitude they employ in public prayer. When the Christians of the first centuries are represented in the Roman catacombs as in the act of prayer it is always *standing* with the faces looking upwards. And it is easy to divine why. The scope of Christ's teaching, while not diminishing men's reverence for the Almighty, is to reveal the *fatherhood* of God, and give men nearness of access to Him, (Heb. 10, '2) a different feeling prompting the Christian from the legal servile conception of Deity, which makes the "Barbary Moor" throw himself on his face upon the ground. In the highest service rendered to God the worshippers are represented as standing (Rev. 7, 9.) If Christian prayer were *all confession*, then kneeling would be unquestionably the most becoming attitude, but according to the model which Jesus has bequeathed to us confession forms but an inconsiderable part of prayer.

If, however, "Watchman" is not convinced by what has been advanced on this point, here are two authorities he will probably not gainsay. The direction in Pollanus' liturgy is "*Ac toto hoc tempore (during confession and absolution) populus magnus cum reverentia ostat, vel procumbit in genua, ut animus cujusque tulerit.*" And it was not until the last revision of the English Book of Common Prayer that posture in the Daily service was prescribed, *except in the Creed and Confession*. In conclusion, on this point, I quote from the learned Dean of Westminster, who has shown singular candour on every occasion when treating of matters affecting Presbytery. "To pray standing, was in public worship believed to have been an Apostolic usage. The Presbyterians of Scotland, and at times the Lutherans of Germany, are probably the only Occidental christians who now observe the one only rubric laid down for christian worship by the first "Œcumenical Council" (Stanley's Eastern Church, p. 263.) Instead of its being regarded, therefore, as unseemly irreverence and a consulting of convenience that Presbyterians stand at public prayer, I forbear from retorting as I might do by animadverting upon the indecency of persons *sitting upon* their cushions instead of either standing or kneeling as one frequently sees the majority of

worshippers (?) do in certain churches that shall not be named.

The last improvement in the practice of the kirk "Watchman" desires is that the worshippers shall join with the officiating minister in repeating the Lord's prayer. Now it appears to me with all deference to the church of which "Watchman" is a member this would be no improvement at all. I submit if the Babel of sounds, on as many different keys as there are persons, one hears in the church of England when the people repeat the Creed and Lord's Prayer is very edifying or productive of devotion. Would it not be more decorous if they joined only mentally and spiritually in these exercises, in solemn silence? But according to "Watchman" they would not be praying at all if they did not speak. Here are his words: "The Presbyterians do not pray for themselves as in the Church of England." What an ungodly set they must be forsooth! No wonder after making such a discovery that "Watchman" should conclude with these words:

"Open immorality is taking deep root in this city, and it is high time that both ministers and congregations should arise from their apathy.' One would suppose from the connection in which this paragraph stood with what he had just alleged, that the want of repeating the Lord's Prayer after the minister, on the part of Presbyterians, was the cause of the "open immorality." But enough of this. It is clear that the person officiating in the Apostolic Church was the mouthpiece of the congregation in public prayer, and that their minds and hearts were exercised in attention to his utterances, to which they signified their assent by saying "Amen" (1 Cor., 14, 16.) While Presbyterians claim to join *mentally* and *spiritually* in the prayers of their ministers, as well as to utter a silent "Amen" to the petitions offered in their name, the only improvement in their present practice desirable is that they should utter their "Amen" *aloud*.

THISTLE.

Montreal, July 13, 1869.

## The Churches and their Missions.

### GENERAL ASSEMBLY.

(Continued.)

May 24th.

An overture was taken up from the Presbytery of Dumfries asking the Assembly to decide that its legal adviser should not at the same time be a member of the court. Mr. Underwood, Irongray, proposed, and Mr. Wilson, New Abbey seconded the adoption of the overture.

DR. WALLACE also supported the overture. It seemed to him that the duties of the Procurator were twofold. First, he had to watch over the proceedings of the General Assembly in their interest, so that if the Assembly would in any matter, from mistake or ignorance, be taking a wrong direction in matters of which he was qualified to judge, he would, either through the Moderator or by himself, interpose with a notice of warning to the Assembly. Secondly, he would be in the court as a man of reference, to be consulted by the Assembly in regard to any matters coming within his province that he was qualified to give any advice upon. If these were the two functions belonging to the office, it seemed to him altogether absurd to argue that his mouth would be hermetically sealed. (Laughter, and Hear, hear.) He thought that the Procurator should aid in the court only as an assessor, and not as a co-ordinate member with themselves; and in the position of assessor he would be able to give the Assembly all the benefits of information they sought. He thought there were many serious disadvantages arising from the Procurator being a member of the court that constituted good reasons for their not permitting him to do so. For example, were the Procurator to be a member of the court,

they would give a great accession of strength to a class in the House which he would venture to call the permanent element in the House, as distinguished from the rotating members. There was what he had called the permanent element in the general Assembly. There was a great resemblance in that respect between the General Assembly and the starry firmament. Both of them possessed planetary bodies and fixed stars. (Laughter.) They all knew that the fixed stars—in the heavenly expanse he meant—had contracted a habit of winking to each other. (Renewed laughter.) He was not at all sure that the permanent members of the General Assembly differed considerably in that respect from their celestial brethren. (Laughter.) Of course he did not mean to accuse the permanent members of the General Assembly of the impropriety of the physical gesticulation, but he thought that unconsciously a freemasonry had been introduced among the permanent members. He thought he had observed them mentally passing notes from one constellation to another. He thought he had seen a sort of luminous telegraphing—mental and emotional, no doubt—passing from the Great Bear and the Goat on the one side, to the Little Bear and Orion on the other side—(Loud laughter)—so that in this way the permanent element in the General Assembly came to be a united and compact body, even without their becoming conscious of the matter; and whilst he was very far from alleging that the influence of their union—which, of course, was strength—was altogether a pernicious one, on the other hand, he thought that in many respects, such as in the conduct of the business of the General Assembly, and the preservation of a sort of traditional order and dignity, they

were highly useful; yet, at the same time, he thought it was an influence which the rotating element of the Assembly should always keep its eye upon, and always keep its hand upon, in the way of gently repressing it, to keep it in its proper dimensions, lest the time should come when the Assembly would find it necessary, as he believed it had been found necessary, during last century, in a more august Assembly, to pass a resolution stating that the permanent influence had increased, was increasing, and ought to be abolished. (Laughter and applause.) As a transitory member of the House, it was his opinion that it might be dangerous to the legitimate influence of the rotating members were they prepared to say that the Procurator of the Assembly should become one of the *imperium imperio* that represented the permanent influence in the House. (Hear, hear.) His second reason for supporting the overture was, he thought, even a more important one, but it had been already referred to by the supporters of the overture. He thought it was inevitable that if they made the Procurator a member of the House, he would become a party man. He considered it was quite impossible that any man who took a position in such a House would not be a party man. The unfortunate consequences of that inevitable circumstance were these—First, it was unfair to the party that would be opposed to the Procurator; in the second place, he maintained that the Procurator's inevitable party position must warp his judgment; and, in the third place, if he were not permitted to take part in the ordinary discussions, the Procurator having less work to occupy his mind, could give more attention and consideration to the subjects in which his legal advice might be required, and thus his usefulness in the office to which he had been appointed would be increased. For these reasons he begged to support the motion for the adoption of the overture transmitted by the Presbytery of Dumfries. (Applause.)

Mr. FRASER, Leith, said that if the House appointed a Procurator who was not a member of it, the result would be this, that when a matter came before them for discussion, and when the opinion of the Procurator was asked upon it, the house must either follow up the opinion of the Procurator, in whatever direction it might lead, or to a large extent the House must stultify itself; and practically saying—"We asked the opinion of our legal advisers. We did so like many others in similar circumstances without meaning to take it. We do not find it so palatable as we thought it would be, and we do not mean to take it." If the House, therefore, appointed a Procurator not a member of it, he thought there was no escape from either of these positions, and he therefore meant to oppose the overture. (Applause.)

Dr. BARTY said he would detain the House only for a very little. Dr. Wallace has presented his views upon the subject under discussion in a somewhat astronomical aspect. He had great sympathy with the views expressed by Dr. Wallace in regard to the rotatory class of members of the House. But Dr. Wallace did not seem to see that his argument told against the lay element of the Assembly. (Hear, hear.) Very many of the elders were appointed year after year and they constituted an important and valuable

element in the House. Now, he (Dr. Barty) did not object to this, but quite the reverse, and he agreed entirely with Dr. Wallace, that such gentlemen necessarily and naturally acquired influence which those who were only appointed once in six years could not possibly do. What an advantage would it be were such men as Dr. Wallace annually appointed members of Assembly! It would be better for the Assembly, and safer for themselves. Much better would it be, that, instead of Dr. Wallace being a wandering star, as he now was—(Loud laughter and applause)—he should be placed a fixed star in their firmament, and give them the benefit of his permanent light. (Renewed laughter and applause.) Unhappily, in the mean time, if not a wandering star, Dr. Wallace might seem to belong to the constellation of "the still-vexed Bootes." (Laughter) With regard to Dr. Wallace's opinions on the general question as to the office of the Procuratorship, he (Dr. Barty) confessed that he understood Dr. Wallace's astronomy much better than his argument. The astronomy was excellent, the logic but indifferent. (Laughter and applause.) According to Dr. Wallace's proposal the Procurator was not to be a member of the House, and could not open his lips until they were opened for him. But still, according to Dr. Wallace, the legal adviser of the Assembly could do some things. When he saw the Assembly going astray and running dead against a legal rock, he might slip up to the Moderator and whisper in his ear—"There's a rock ahead! will you let me warn the House?" (Laughter.) Well, it might be that the Moderator did not see the rock, and he might say to the Procurator, "Sit down, sir, and I will take the opinion of the House whether there is a rock, ahead or not" (Laughter.) Thus there would be a vote required to discover the existence or the non-existence of the legal rock. Again, members of the House might feel themselves in a difficulty, and might ask the House if they would be graciously pleased to open the lips of the Procurator that their difficulty might be solved. But there might be gentlemen who might be afraid that the Procurator would give an opinion adverse to their views, and who would move that the Procurator should not be heard upon the subject; and so another vote would be called for. Indeed a number of votes might require to be taken before the poor Procurator would be allowed to pronounce an opinion. Dr. Wallace's last argument was, that permitting the Procurator to be a member of the House would tend to make him a violent partisan. Now, he disliked to have to do with a man who moved about in the dark unseen and unheard. Let them have him on the floor of the Assembly opening his lips without fear, and thus free discussion will enable all to test the value of his opinions. The worst of all partisanships is that which pleads and plots in the dark, which moves secret springs which dumb in the House are exceedingly eloquent and busy in the lobbies. (Applause.) He would much prefer that the Procurator should be in a position to open his lips as he saw cause, and to express his opinions when he pleased, that all might be able to understand whether or not the fixed star shed a malignant influence. (Loud laughter and applause.)

Dr. PINE said that he had intended to deliver his views on the question before the House, but felt now that that was unnecessary. His friend behind him (Dr. Wallace) had a horror seemingly of fixed stars, but after what had been said by Dr. Barty, his friend's astronomy would no more be heard of. (Laughter.) The astronomical part of the discussion had, however, been very well done by the two gentlemen, and had been ably brought to a close by Dr. Barty. (Hear, hear.) But in reference to the subject under discussion, he wished to call the attention of the House to a consideration of immense importance. It must be known to those who took any part in the business of the Church, how useful the Procurator was in the committees. The amount of benefit that was derived from his being on committees, more especially in the committees formed of junior members, was very great. Even amongst the members who had had the greatest experience, it was found that they could not do without the advice of the Procurator in a great proportion of the committees on which they sat. (Hear, hear.) He therefore wished the house to understand that the Procurator could not be a member of those committees unless he was also a member of the Court. (Hear, hear.) In regard to the Procurator of the Church being a party man, he thought it was very obvious, from the nature of the case, that the man who would most likely struggle against party feeling was the man who would be in the Procurator's chair. (Applause.)

The Assembly divided, and the Clerk announced that the following was the result of the vote:—

For the first motion..... 31

For the second motion..... 171

The overture was accordingly dismissed by a majority of 141.

WEDNESDAY, May 26.

### THE DEBATE ON PATRONAGE.

The Assembly then proceeded to consider the report on the Committee of Patronage as follows:—

"This Committee was appointed, according to the terms of the remit—'To enquire (1) regarding the nomination of ministers to vacant parishes; (2) As to the evils which are alleged to arise under the present law of patronage; (3) To consider whether any modifications thereon are called for and can be made; (4) Further, to communicate with influential parties as to such modifications as may appear likely to command success, and to support the interests of religion and the Church; and (5) to report to next General Assembly.'

"The motion which issued in the appointment of the committee was a third motion brought forward in preference to two other motions before the General Assembly, the first of which proposed to take steps with a view to the immediate alteration of the present law of patronage, and the second of which maintained that no sufficient grounds had been shown for taking any such steps, or for any further agitation of the subject. The main object of the third motion was to unite parties in an impartial and comprehensive enquiry into all the facts

of the case, and so possibly to open up the way for some satisfactory settlement of difficulties which have so long distracted the Church. To what extent the Committee has been successful in this object remains to be seen. It has faithfully endeavoured to carry out the trust committed to it.

"The committee met upon the day after the rising of last General Assembly, when they resolved to make enquiry, in terms of the remit to them, regarding the nomination of ministers to vacant parishes, and as to the evils which are alleged to arise under the present law of patronage; they accordingly appointed a sub-committee to frame the queries to be submitted to Presbyteries and elders. That sub-committee met upon the 3d June, and adjusted the queries, which will be found upon page 20; and these queries, with a circular in the terms printed at page 20, were transmitted to Presbytery clerks, and such elders as had been members of any Assembly during the last five years, upon 10th June. In an appendix to this report the returns received from 81 out of the 84 Presbyteries are printed; the three Presbyteries who have made no returns being Mull, Inverness and Dingwall. The number of elders, to whom in terms of the resolution of the committee the queries were sent, was about 460, and in the appendix will be found the answers received from 67 of these elders.

"Such of these answers as had been received up to 20th December, consisting of sixty-eight returns from Presbyteries, and all the returns of elders, were circulated among the members of committee on 25th December, and the committee met again on 13th January. The minute of this meeting will be found at page xii. After coming to a resolution that evils do arise under the present law of patronage, and that a modification of the law is called for, the committee were of opinion that the time had come when they ought, in terms of the second part of the remit to them, to communicate with patrons and other influential parties; and they accordingly adjusted the statement printed at page xxii, which was circulated upon 18th February to every private patron of the Church so far as their addresses could be found, being in number about 240. To this statement answers were received from 37 patrons, representing 97 patronages, of whom 21, holding 70 patronages, expressed themselves as favourable to a change in the law; 14 patrons, holding 28 patronages, expressed themselves as opposed to any change in the law; while the remaining two merely acknowledged receipt of the statement, without giving any expression of their opinion in reply. No written answer was received from the remaining patrons.

"In replying to the statement sent him, Sir R. Anstruther, Bart., member of Parliament for Fifeshire, stated that he intended after Easter to move for a select committee of the House of Commons to enquire into the present law of patronage. It is not for the committee to express an opinion as to the expediency of a Parliamentary committee upon this subject, especially as Sir Robert Anstruther, who is a member of Assembly, has agreed to postpone his motion till after the meeting of Assembly.

"The committee have attempted to make an

abstract of the returns of Presbyteries, which will be found prefixed to the returns themselves. It seems unnecessary here to comment upon the information contained in the answers to the first four queries submitted to Presbyteries; but upon the fifth query submitted to Presbyteries, and the fourth submitted to elders, the committee will state generally the purport of the answers, in so far as they suggest specific alterations.

"1. The following Presbyteries suggest that the patronage should be transferred from the present patrons to a board of electors in each parish:—Dunbar, Stranraer, Irvine, Inverary, St. Andrews, Forfar, Kincardine O'Neil, Abergariff, Lerwick, and Skye; while Paisley and Cupar suggest this alternatively with other plans. The Presbytery of Stranraer propose that the body of electors be permanent; Paisley and Cupar, that failing their electing in three or four months, the right of the patron should revive; Inverary, the patron should also have the power of vetoing the nomination. This plan is recommended by eight laymen in its main features.

"2. The following Presbyteries suggest that the communicants should have the power of electing their own minister for three months after the occurrence of the vacancy, and that, failing their doing so by a certain defined majority, then the right of the patron should revive:—Glasgow, Dunblane (Cupar and St. Andrews, alternatively with plans Nos. 1 and 3), Deer and Olnafirth. This plan is supported by seven laymen.

"3. The following Presbyteries recommend the giving the communicants a right of vetoing any presentee without stating reasons:—Auchterarder (Cupar and St. Andrews), alternatively with plans Nos. 1 and 2). This plan is suggested by four laymen.

"4. The following Presbyteries recommend popular election:—Nairn, North Isles, Perth, Weem and Burrayoe. This plan is recommended by twelve laymen.

"5. The Presbytery of Arbroath recommend the repeal of the Act of Queen Anne. This plan is recommended by one layman.

"Upon these various plans the committee respectfully offer the following suggestions—

"Plan No. 1 is, in some measure, virtually a return to the Act of 1690, cap. 23, which enacts—'In case of the vacancy of any particular church, and for supplying the same with a minister, the heritors of the said parish (being Protestants) and the elders are to name and propose the person to the whole congregation to be either approved or disapproved by them, and, if they disapprove, that the disapprovers give in their reasons, to the effect the affairs may be cognosed upon by the Presbytery of the bounds, at whose judgment, and by whose determination, the calling and entry of a particular minister is to be ordered and concluded.' In the event of this plan being adopted, it will be necessary to make some provision for those parishes in which there could not be found the elements out of which such a board as is contemplated could be formed. It is also observable that, by the Act of 1690, the nomination lay with the heritors and elders. Looking to the great advance which has taken place since that

time in the intelligence of the people, it is not unreasonable to suppose that the communicants ought now to have a voice along with the heritors and elders of the parish.

"2. The second plan is one entitled to serious consideration, in consequence of the quarters in which it has been suggested; but it appears doubtful, on the one hand, whether patrons would not object to be treated in the manner which it proposes; and, on the other hand, whether, in country parishes especially, such a system is the best that could be devised.

"3. This plan is a proposal to return to the system of nomination in practice between the years 1834 and 1843. Not to speak of other serious objections to this plan, it no longer appears to be regarded as likely to command success. Only one Presbytery decidedly recommends it.

"4. Without adverting specially to what may have taken place in other communions, it may be stated without offence that experience does not point to this system either as that best calculated to secure efficient ministers, or as that least calculated to produce unseemly discord and contentions among congregations.

"5. The simple repeal of the Act of Queen Anne would leave the law of patronage to rest upon the Act of 1690, and while that enactment might be returned to in spirit, it would in some respects be unsuitable to the present age.

"Your committee have anxiously considered whether, under the remit to them, it was their duty to make any recommendation as to the nature of the alteration in the law which should be sought, and having come, on 13th January last, to the resolution that a modification was called for, they have, after mature deliberation, resolved to report to the Assembly that in their opinion the change in the law most likely to command success and to promote the interests of religion and the Church is substantially the plan No. 1; and they therefore recommend that the right to nominate ministers shall be transferred from the present patrons to a board in each parish, composed of the following parties, viz:—1. Heritors or their representatives being members of the Church; 2. Elders of the parish; and, 3. Male communicants.

"The committee are further of opinion that in any enactment which will be necessary to give effect to this resolution, provision should be made for giving reasonable compensation to patrons."

Appended to the report are minutes of the meetings of the committee, and dissents, &c.

The Clerk read the following overtures:—

"At Kirkcubright, the fifth day of May, one thousand eight hundred and sixty-nine years; which day the Presbytery of Kirkcubright met and was constituted:—*Inter alia*, agreeably to notice given at last meeting, Mr. Cook now moved that the Presbytery transmit the following overture to the General Assembly:—

"Whereas the law of patronage, as modified by Lord Aberdeen's Act, has on the whole worked satisfactorily towards securing a zealous and efficient ministry, and maintaining the peace and stability of the Church, whilst the legal rights both of patrons and presentees are

respected, and the just privileges of congregations recognised; and whereas all proposals hitherto submitted to your venerable House for further modifying the existing law of patronage, by procuring acts of Parliament in terms of such modifications, have been found inconsistent with the aforesaid rights and privileges of patrons, presentees, and congregations, obviously impracticable in their provisions, or likely to foment division and agitation in vacant parishes; and whereas it is manifest that the present time is unfavourable to any appeal to the Legislature on the part of the Church, unless on the clearest and most urgent necessity, which has not in the present case been generally asserted, far less attempted to be proven—It is humbly overtured, by the Presbytery of Kirkcudbright, that your venerable House, taking these premises into consideration, resolve to resist any recommendation to modify through Parliament, the existing law of patronage, but to uphold the same: or otherwise, as may in your wisdom seem calculated to maintain and further the peace and prosperity of the Church as by law established. Which motion having been seconded, it was also moved and seconded—‘that this overture be not transmitted.’ It was agreed that the state of the vote should be ‘transmit,’ or ‘not,’ and the roll being called and votes marked, it carried ‘transmit,’ by nine votes to five, whereupon the Presbytery did and hereby do transmit an overture to the General Assembly in the above terms. From this finding of the Presbytery, Dr. Maitland and Messrs. Murray, Gillespie, Sturrock, and Candlish entered their dissent.”

“At Forres, the twenty-seventh day of April one thousand eight hundred and sixty-nine years; which day the Provincial Synod of Moray being met and constituted: *Inter alia*—

“The Synod then took up consideration of the overture by Mr. Cushny, Speymouth, and others, anent procedure by the Assembly regarding the appointment of ministers, which was read, and Mr. Cushny being heard in support of it, moved its adoption; which motion was seconded by Dr. Wylie. It was also moved by Dr. Sellar, that the overture be not adopted; which motion was seconded by Dr. Brander. There being thus two motions before the Synod, it was agreed that the state of the vote should be first or second motion—the first motion being Mr. Cushny’s and the second Dr. Sellar’s; and the roll being called and votes marked, it carried first motion by 10 to 5, which therefore became the finding of the Synod, from which finding Dr. Sellar dissented. The tenor follows.—

“Whereas the last General Assembly did, on 27th day of May 1868, appoint a committee to enquire regarding the nomination of ministers to vacant parishes, and as to the evils which are alleged to arise under the present law of patronage, and to consider whether any modifications thereon are called for, and can be made: and whereas the said committee was instructed to communicate with influential parties on this subject, and to report to the Assembly appointed to meet in May ensuing—It is hereby humbly overtured by the Provincial Synod of Moray to the venerable the General Assembly, indited to meet at Edinburgh on the 29th day of May,

1869, that if the said committee shall agree in recommending any definite scheme for altering or modifying the law of patronage, as now exercised under ‘The Benefices Act,’ such scheme shall be submitted to the various Presbyteries of the Church for their deliberate consideration, in terms of the Barrier Act, 1697, before any application be made to the Legislature, or other action be taken thereon.”

“At Newton-Stewart, the twenty-seventh day of April, eighteen hundred and sixty-nine years; which day the Synod of Galloway being met and constituted:—*Inter alia*, The Synod agreed to transmit to the General Assembly the following overture:—

“Whereas, the Assembly may be expected to arrive at resolutions, from the returns in the hands of the Patronage Committee, and the report thereof, it is humbly overtured that said resolutions on a question so directly and vitally affecting the constitution of the Church, should be sent down to Presbyteries for consideration: and that until the views of the different Church judicatories be ascertained, no steps be taken in connection therewith.”

Dr. PIRIE said—I rise to address the House at this time under a sense of the deepest responsibility and with the utmost anxiety, not because I have the smallest doubt of the wisdom or the rightness of the motion with which I propose to conclude, but because I hold that the determination of the General Assembly upon this question will be of vital importance. I do not say, observe, to the Church—I do not say to the Establishment; for important as such considerations may be, I regard both as secondary objects—But with respect to the interests of religion at large, with respect to the peace of the Church and with respect to unity amongst the whole Christian body of Scotland. It is on these grounds that I feel anxiety. For one moment before proceeding to the general question, let me direct the attention of members to the report from the Patronage Committee which is now in their hands. You will find from that report that the large proportion of the Presbyteries have reported. I believe that there are only three Presbyteries in the Church that have not reported, and one at least of these was specially engaged with respect to another affair which prevented it from doing so. The great mass of these Presbyteries—I forget the precise number, but certainly the great mass—had reported in favour of a change upon the present law of patronage in Scotland. (Hear, hear.) I go farther than this; for I hold that you will perceive, on turning to the report, that the vast mass of the opinions which these Presbyteries express are substantively at one. There are slight differences, undoubtedly but the principle of the abolition of patronage runs through almost the whole of them: and there is hardly one of them, I believe, to be found, even where they are opposed to the abolition of patronage, that does not admit directly or indirectly that patronage is inconsistent with the feelings and with the sympathies of the people of Scotland. (Hear, hear.) Almost the same remarks apply to the eldership. Those of the elders who have made returns

are by a large majority in favour of a change or a modification of the law of patronage, or of its entire abolition; and so far the same remark is also applicable with respect to the comparatively small number of patrons who have made returns. I admit that there is but a small proportion of patrons who have made returns; but of those who have, a number of them, much to their credit, are in favour of a modification, or of the abolition of patronage. (Hear, hear.) In these circumstances we come before you on exceedingly favourable grounds; and I repeat that it is not merely for the sake of the Church, still less is it in a party sense, that I now come forward. I most readily admit that the time was when I held that patronage was useful as it was then exercised in the Church of Scotland; but I hold that while a man is not to change his opinion without due, earnest, and prayerful consideration, yet that he is not a wise but a foolish man who refuses to change his opinion when he finds that circumstances have become changed; or even supposing that he has not done so, and that the circumstances are not changed, if he is convinced that former prejudices, former prepossessions, and former authority have led him to adopt an erroneous view. (Hear.) I bring the motion forward now because I believe it essential to the welfare of Christianity in this country. I had the honor of proposing a similar motion a good many years ago; and I believe had the motion been then adopted—as it was only rejected by the smallest possible majority—that at this day we would have been in smooth waters. The first point to which I direct attention is this—that we are asking no change which is inconsistent with the principles of the Church of Scotland. On the contrary, patronage was altogether unknown to the primitive Church, and it has been opposed to the principles of Presbyterianism even from the beginning. At the time of Constantine patronage was unknown to the primitive Church; but the system of patronage gradually grew up and gradually extended itself with the progress of Popery. In the Presbyterian Church at Pesth, I think, where Presbyterianism was primarily set up after the Reformation, and in the Swiss Church, patronage was unknown. In the Church of Scotland patronage has been protested against from the beginning. I know full well that allusion has been made with a voice of triumph to the letter of John Knox, in which he says that he had no wish to deprive the Sovereign and the patrons of their patronages. But that was not the object which John Knox had in view; that was not the plan which he would have preferred; but that was the plan which he adopted out of necessity. What he said was, that under the then circumstances of the country, he was prepared to allow of patronage existing rather than that there should be no settlement of the Church question at all. The real opinions of John Knox were to be found in the First Book of Discipline, which you all full well know were substantively written by John Knox, and the principles of popular election are there laid down in the clearest and strongest terms it is possible for language to express. In the Second Book of Discipline, one of

our main standards, the question narrowed so far, because at that time we had the clergy having entire command of the Church, and it must be admitted they reserved a considerably large proportion of the power to themselves. At the same time, in the Second Book of Discipline it was specially declared that no man should be intruded on a congregation contrary to the will of the people. Can language be more plain than this? In fact I am convinced that under all ordinary circumstances the claim of the church courts made at the time was little more than what is now equivalent to examinations, ordinations, and inductions, and almost the whole power in those times was left in the hands of the Christian people. As it happened again as you know full well, patronage by main force was established upon the people of Scotland. But what happened the first moment that the people of Scotland were substantively free? In the Act of 1649 you have patronage again abolished, and popular election substantively and strongly affirmed. Again, under the tyrannical reigns of Charles II. and his bigoted brother, patronage was forced upon the people; but the moment that there was an opening for the popular expression of opinion, at the time of the Revolution, that moment we have again an effort made at popular elections. If to a certain extent the claim was narrowed, that was not the fault of the clergy; it was not the fault of the people, but the narrowing was pressed upon the people and the clergy alike by the power of the Government. We have patronage again restored in the year 1712, and by whom? By the most unpatriotic Government that ever existed. I say that patronage was then restored by the ministry of Bolingbroke for the purpose of irritating the people of Scotland, and inducing them to join the Jacobites, for the purpose of the restoration of the house of Stuart. Now, I do not wonder after all that patronage was restored at that time, for you know full well that this country was then becoming a most powerful aristocracy; and I regret that it is a difficult thing to conceive of a thoroughly popular franchise existing in the Church, with a strong aristocracy or an oligarchy in the State. But it is perfectly true and that was the reason why patronage was restored at that time. But, notwithstanding, what happened? Why, our forefathers, the General Assemblies of the Church of Scotland, petitioned against patronage down to the year 1784. Year after year they implored Parliament to remove this great evil; they sometimes appealed to Parliament and sometimes they simply entered a general protest. Surely, therefore, this is a principle indisputable in the Presbyterian Church, that the people should have a voice in the election of their minister. And now again the moment that these popular influences began to grow in more recent times, what took place? Why, the moment they appeared again the people recurred to the same object, and desired the abolition of patronage. We know that it was begun almost at the moment that the Reform Bill of 1832 was passed. It was indicated even before that, the people knowing that they had been contending for popular franchise in the Church long, long before a popular-

franchise in the State was ever spoken of, or dreamt of, the appeal was again renewed, and something was again done. Many of us hoped, and earnestly hoped, that the result of the appeal—viz., the measure which was passed under the name of Lord Aberdeen's Act—would be sufficient to effect the end which was then in view. That it had done so, seemed to be the impression of this respectable Presbytery of Kirkcudbright, but we shall soon see whether they are correct in the impression, or whether they are not so far removed somehow or other from the general mass of society as not to be aware of the facts of the case, and of the feeling existing in the country. (Laughter and hisses.) I will remark just generally, that inconsistent institutions in the Church and State can never by possibility exist in any country. I believe James VI. was perfectly right when he said, "No bishop, no king," in the sense in which he used the word king. It is impossible that a popular franchise can exist in any country, in the Church under a system of anything approaching to despotism. But I rejoice to say that if ever there was a sovereign who was herself free, and loved to grant freedom to her subjects, it is the Sovereign who now occupies the throne. (Cheers.) I trust, therefore, that the noble Lord who has interrupted me (the Earl of Selkirk) will be satisfied that the statements I have made respecting the relations of the Sovereign to the Church, are quite in conformity with his own view. (Laughter.) I go further, and say that there cannot be a popular franchise in the Church for a lengthened period of time, if there were a strong aristocracy established as a civil government. The thing is impracticable and impossible, and hence it was under a strong aristocracy—I am not finding fault with the Government, but simply stating a philosophical and experimental fact—that the elements of patronage were introduced and forced upon the people of Scotland. The consequence was that we were to sustain, and Government to introduce into the Church, a certain measure of the aristocratic element. But where the popular franchise is extended in a State, it would be equally impossible that there could exist in a Church such as ours, which is essentially popular in its elements, as I have shown you, the same element of aristocracy. I say, as I have long said, that in our Church, there should be a popular franchise. When the people have received a franchise so broad in the State as they have in this country, they naturally say—"If that be the case surely you are still more bound to allow us the popular franchise in the election of our ministers, which has been sought for from the foundation of the Church, and which has appertained to every portion of the Church and every portion of her history? Can there be any doubt or difficulty as to the right of the people to ask this question, more especially when you consider that many of the patrons of the Church are not members of her own body? No man respects more than I do the Episcopal Church, very nearly as I am connected with it in more ways than one, and with some parties of the Church I sympathise most cordially. I do not wish to say anything regarding that Church in the way of disparage-

ment, but we are living in days when in a Church like ours it cannot continue that the great mass of the patrons should belong to another denomination. I put it to you whether the Church of England or the people of England would submit to it for one moment if the vast mass of their patrons were presbyterians? I say they would not; and I say they would be right not to tolerate it, and I for one honour them for feeling as they do. But I cannot forget, though I repeat it, that I regard the Church of England with the greatest possible respect; and I do not intend to give offence, but the very reverse. I cannot forget because the people will not forget, that at this moment a large proportion of the Episcopalians in Scotland do not belong to that portion of the Church of England, nor are their sentiments conformable with that portion of the Church of England with which I and, I believe, almost every member of the General Assembly sympathise. We know that some of their most influential office-bearers have given forth opinions—I do not believe intentionally, for the gentleman to whom I especially refer is a learned and most respectable, and, I believe, most excellent man—but he has unconsciously given forth opinions which are somewhat of an offensive character, in which he has characterised the Episcopalian Church as the Church of the gentry, and he has divided himself from us upon the ground that we are not the Church of the gentry, but the Church of the middle and of the lower orders. I am quite aware that there are many exceptions, as a friend near me says, to those who think so. But my object is if possible, by this measure not to break off from the aristocracy. I admire the aristocracy of England in many respects; and I wish they were more closely connected with us. I believe it is unnecessary to enter into particulars; but I firmly believe that the very motion that I intend to propose to you, if carried, will be the very best possible means of bringing back the aristocracy to the communion of the Church of Scotland. (Applause and laughter.) We wish to have an opportunity of uniting them once more with their people; and that their people and they shall once more be seen worshipping in the same Church. (Applause.) I have referred to Lord Aberdeen's Bill, which the Presbytery of Kirkcudbright have admired so much. (A laugh.) I need not dwell upon that because there is in the report a passage which occurred to me almost on first turning it up. You will see there, an account of the working of Lord Aberdeen's Bill in one part of the country; and although, perhaps, it is not so strongly expressed, it is working precisely in the same fashion in another. It is in page 155, and is as follows:—"It is an evil of a serious nature resulting from the exercise of the right of patronage since the passing of the Church Benefices Act, that the corresponding right of objecting to a presentee is practically inoperative within the bounds of this presbytery, because, however good the objections, the people are unequal to the heavy pecuniary responsibility of opposing a settlement. In one recent instance, the poor people who successfully opposed a settlement were so heavily involved with the expenses of the opposition, that

after the presentation was abandoned, *any presentee*, so far as they were concerned, would have been settled without opposition. Their expenses are, to a large extent, still unpaid." A noble Lord near me says that that was the fault of the Presbytery. It happened to be the slight fault that they had no money. (A laugh.) The statement goes on to say—"The result, after a very protracted trial, was that the presentee, aged sixty-five years, abandoned the presentation at the bar of the General Assembly. There has not been any secession, nor has there, it is believed, been desertion to any extent. The people are generally attached to the Church, but there is every reason to believe that secession or desertion will be the result, if the right of presenting to a vacant benefice be exercised hereafter in such a way as to exclude the wishes and influence of the members of the Church. There is very general dissatisfaction with the existing law of patronage. The grounds upon which this dissatisfaction rest are—1st, The conviction, which is growing strong among members, that they ought to have the choice, or at least to have a very large influence in the choosing of the ministers to be set over them. They feel that the responsibility of the choice ought to rest with themselves in some form, and not with a person who may not only have no interest in their well-being, but may be an enemy to their true interests. 2nd, That the sitting member of Parliament for the county is a near relative of the patron of the four parish churches within the bounds. He has sat as member for years previous to the Church Benefices Act, and it is generally believed (not without good reason within the bounds of this Presbytery) that presentations are made to serve political purposes. 3rd, That the gift and issuing of presentations by a patron's commissioner, not a member of the Church of Scotland, can easily become detrimental to the best interests of the Church. Presentations to vacant parishes within the bounds of this Presbytery have of late years been always made by the above-mentioned patron's commissioner, who is a free Churchman, and whose views and feelings consequently must be adverse to the Church of Scotland." (A laugh.) Such statements as these are sufficient, and that is all I require to say upon the general subject of patronage and the operation of Lord Aberdeen's Act. I do think that what has been said and read is perfectly satisfactory for condemning it. I had much more I should like to say, but I am most anxious not to take up your time. I come now to the last and most important particular to which I wish to direct your attention. I say there is an irresistible ground on which we should desire the abolition of patronage, for if you look over Scotland at this time, I regret to say, and we must all admit, that there is a large, though I will not say, increasing amount of infidelity, not to say infidelity, and a large amount of immorality prevailing. And what, I would like to know, is the main cause of these deplorable evils. You all know and believe that the main cause is to be found in the fearful divisions that exist in the Christian, and more especially in the Presbyterian Church. Division, of all other things, is inconsistent with

the character of the Church of Christ. The object of Christ is to promote love, and here we sometimes find, at all events, our divisions among Presbyterians generate not a spirit of love, but I fear a spirit of an opposite character. And it cannot fail to be so. While we are so divided as we are, I believe, in many cases with respect to positive trifles, these trifles occupy the attention of the clergy to an extent far beyond their value. I know full well that both in our own Church and in the dissenting Churches, ministers have a profound reverence for the doctrines of the true gospel. But while men are contending and struggling for life as it were against each other, as a matter of consequence the main point of struggle on which their existence depends comes to acquire a preponderating influence. Our Church, as an established Church, is not intended merely for the interests of a class. I say we are bound to have in view the interests of society at large. Our Church is intended to be the Church of the nation, and it is our bounden duty to make it the Church of the nation if we can. We are bound to look not merely to what will benefit ourselves as a Church limited within certain bounds in the kingdom, but we are bound to look upon ourselves so far as the representatives of the nation at large, and it is one of the highest of our duties to take such steps as we possibly can for the purpose of embracing the largest possible number of our brethren within the bounds of our Church, that the Established Church thereby may be made beneficial to them all. (Hear, hear.) This is the broad and liberal view in which we ought to regard the Establishment, and if we regard it under any other form, if we regard it simply as a small corporate body, embracing one-half, or a little more than one-half of the people, we look at it in a narrow view—a view so narrow, indeed, that we do not deserve to be an Established Church at all. (Hear, hear.) But I believe that that is not the feeling of the members of the Church of Scotland or the members of this General Assembly. I believe we regard it in a broader form, and are anxious at this moment to embrace the people of Scotland within the Church, not for the purpose of increasing the safety of the Church, but of promoting the kingdom of Christ and the glory of God. I ask whether it is possible to do so whilst we have these divisions among us; for I discover that men will fight to the death on behalf of an Established Church, or the three orders of the ministry, or the independence of the Church, or Voluntaryism, who really seem totally to forget that these things, after all can be but incidental points, and that the great point is trust in God, leading to love for man. (Applause.) This is the view that I entertain, and which the General Assembly entertains, and if they do so entertain it, I think there can hardly be a doubt as to what conclusion we shall arrive at to-day. For this desirable end cannot be attained—it is perfectly impossible that it should—I think the most devoted upholder of patronage will admit that it is an object which cannot possibly be attained without the abolition of patronage. We cannot recover the Dissenters, many of whom I believe are looking anxiously at our proceedings, and not a

few of whom are really and sincerely interested in our proceedings, until we attain to a unity, not of form or opinion merely, but of love and charity amongst each other, and this cannot be attained without the abolition of patronage. I do not say that we will immediately bring back Dissenters to our communion, though I believe we will bring back many; but I say when they see these efforts being made to promote right spirit, they will be prepared to look upon our efforts with kindness, and be prepared to lay hold of the olive branch which we hold out to them. One thing I will say, rather than live in the state of confusion, and jealousy, and difference that exists, I do say, let the Established Church, or any other Church in the form of a Church, perish. I say that this state of things in which we are, with a spirit of mutual hatred and perpetual divisions growing in all churches, is leading not merely to the destruction of one Church, but to the destruction of the principles of Christianity themselves. It is perfectly impossible to look around us without feeling that when those who are indifferent look upon our Church, and find disputes existing as to whether there is to be Established Church or Free Church, Independency or Voluntaryism; they may say to one another,—“After all, the disputes of these clergy and Church office-bearers and elders, are all mere incidentals which have no direct bearing either upon the happiness of man or the glory of God, and they not only seem not to promote love, but they promote the very reverse.” Such men are led away by our divisions from the faith, and Christianity itself is injured, while infidelity and immorality continue to prevail. If that is to continue, better, I say, for us to have no Church at all. But I cannot believe that this General Assembly, if they feel that the argument I am now putting forward be sound, will not do what they can to bring about a better state of things. I believe that the Established Church is at this present moment strong, and I believe that if we take the right measures, it will continually become stronger still. I believe at this present moment we are in a position to put forth this olive branch of peace successfully, and I believe it will be accepted, and that our Church will grow continually more and more every day. Moderator, I think we have a grand prospect before us. I believe that this General Assembly may be for a blessing in our country and the interests of Religion. I believe we will be referred to in future times as having been members, of the General Assembly of 1869, which abolished patronage, considering its abolition as the object aimed at by the Church for three hundred years. It would be a great thing, not that we saved the Established Church, which would be a great thing, but because we held out the olive branch, and tried to put an end to division and tumult, and to mutual suspicion, jealousy and distrust—because we, as an Established Church, held forth this olive branch of peace to our brethren, the Dissenters, telling them that we are prepared to take every step we can for the purpose, not of injuring them, but for the purpose of uniting them with ourselves, and of realising the grand end of Christianity, the spirit of love manifested by Him who descended from mansions of glory to seek

and to save us. I am not without hopes that by degrees this grand object may be attained, and that the people of Scotland may once more be cemented together. I am not without hopes that our motto, “Nec tamen consumeatur,” will yet shine forth, clear and beautiful as in the days of our forefathers, “clear as the sun, fair as the moon, and terrible as an army with banners.” (Cheers.) I move as follows:—

“The General Assembly having heard the report of the Committee on Patronage appointed last year, approve the diligence of the committee, and adopt the said report, in so far as it indicates the evils which have arisen from the existing law of patronage, the advantages which would arise from the abolition thereof, with such compensation to patrons as may appear just and expedient, and generally in so far as it recommends that the nomination of ministers should be vested in heritors, elders, and communicants, leaving the details, both as to the constitution of the nominating body and as to the respective powers of the nominating body and the congregation at large, to be arranged so that there should be conferred on the permanent male communicants in each parish the greatest amount of influence in the election of ministers which may be found consistent with the preservation of order and regularity in the proceedings.”

Mr. T. G. MURRAY, W. S.—I rise to second this motion, and after the very full and exhaustive statement of Dr. Pirie I shall not presume to travel over the same ground. I shall only attempt to vindicate, in a very few sentences, the grounds on which I have arrived at the conclusions embodied in this report, which I am aware differ somewhat from the grounds on which many others have arrived at the same conclusion. I hope I may say that in taking so early a part in a discussion on which so many members wish to offer an opinion, I should at least give a good example in one respect. What I have to say may not be instructive, it may not be convincing, but at least I shall be brief. (Applause.) I have first to say personally for myself that I have no sympathy with those who reckon patronage unscriptural. I think on the contrary, there is much to be said in theory for patronage, as enabling patrons, undisturbed by considerations which attach to more popular bodies, and in a less disturbed if not a clearer atmosphere, to select ministers suited for a particular parish. I think that, in the main, patronage has been well and wisely administered by the patrons of Scotland; but I think the question is not now to be decided on theoretical considerations, but that we must view it as a question of practical expediency, and we must consider what is best for the Church and for the people of Scotland in the position in which we are now placed. Sir, my first proposition is one which I supposed I need hardly proceed to establish on the floor of this House—namely, that the Established Church is a national blessing, not only as a national recognition of God, but as affording ordinances to parts of the country where, from the sparse population, or from the poverty of the people, Voluntaryism might fail to afford it. Also, further, I think, as affording true religious liberty, making the expression of opinion not dependent on the will of the peo-

ple. ("Hear, hear," and applause.) In those days, when we hear so much about the effect of national establishments, I, without entering further into the subject, would advise those who wish to pursue that enquiry in a philosophic spirit to a work recently published by Mr. Matthew Arnold. I think he lays down there in some very striking passages that there has always been a more full and complete development of humanity in establishments; that the great works by which the human spirit has helped forward the world's general advancement have been all by men who have belonged to or been trained by an establishment; and he illustrates this not only by a reference to those names which we are accustomed to identify with an establishment, such as Butler, Hooker, Barrow, and others, but also those who are looked upon as dissenters, such as Milton, Wesley, Baxter, and many others who were all trained in establishments. If we admit the proposition, then, is it not our duty to make the National Church as comprehensive as possible, to do all in our power both to retain in our Church those who are already in it and to enable those who have conscientiously left it conscientiously to return to it? (Applause.) Now, sir, as to the feelings of those in the Church, can any one doubt that there exists a strong desire on the part of the people to have more power in the nomination of the ministers? I think that is very natural, when you view the advance of intelligence on the part of the people. If you trace the state of the country now with what it was one hundred years ago, what do you find? At that time the majority of the heritors were members of the Established Church and the people saw in the patrons, or in the equivalent classes, all political power; but now I fear—and I regret to say it is a subject I wont enter upon—I fear a majority of the patrons do not belong to the Establishment and you have the people themselves in the possession of that political power which the patrons, and those equivalent to them, formerly had. Now, it might be very well to point out to the people that there is no analogy between the election of a member of Parliament and the election of a minister; but I am afraid that logic will generally fail. Their logic will be this—that matters spiritual are more important than matters temporal, and they will say, why, if they have the right to elect a member of Parliament, surely they should have something to say in the election of a minister. I wont go over the report of the committee, but Dr. Pirie has shown generally that that feeling is abroad, and I would just ask—Did ever any one meet the greatest stickler for patronage who did not make an exception in his own favour? who, if there was a vacancy in his own parish, did not say, "It is very fortunate that it remains with the patron, and of course, he will consult me before he nominates any one to the Church; and it is very natural that he should do so, because I attend the parish church, and he never looks at it?" Or again, take the case of a Crown vacancy, is the Home Secretary, in calm retirement, and with the assistance he would get from old moderators and others, to elect the best presentee to the parish? Do the heritors of the parish besiege him with applications that he should do nothing until they

nominate some one to be appointed? It is a trite saying, but it cannot be too often remarked, that there is this great characteristic of all the secessions, that not one of these have been on matters of doctrine. (Applause.) Those who have left the Church still are at one with her in doctrine, in discipline, and in worship. I wont go over the grounds of the different secessions of 1733, 1754, and 1843, but this I will say, that they were all occasioned by patronage. I am aware that there may be other views inconsistent with the idea of an Establishment now adopted by many who have left the Church; but I still think and hold that the great mass of Presbyterians in Scotland who do not belong to the Church dissent from her only on the question of patronage. And in regard to the last and great secession of 1843, I would just like, in reference to the views stated by some of those who then left us, to read a resolution of the Assembly of 1842, which preceded the Disruption, and which is in these terms:—"The General Assembly having considered the overtures anent patronage, did, and hereby do, resolve and declare that patronage is a grievance which has been attended with much injury to the cause of true religion in this Church and kingdom, is the main cause of the difficulties in which the Church is at present involved, and that it ought to be abolished." That, I think, is conclusive proof that at that time, at least, the main ground on which they left the Church was patronage. Now, sir, if patronage has been the cause of past secession, then why should we still keep to it in all its rigid integrity? I have no objection to patronage, but, on the other hand, I do not think it is such a divine right that I insist on retaining it. This is not a time to shut our ears to the views that are abroad as to the Church Establishments and as to making the national Church the exponent of the national will. We must not forget whatever may be our views as to the duty of the State to maintain the Established Church as a great national institution, that there will be always great danger for an Established Church unless a very large proportion of the country take the benefit of our ministrations. I will not go over the proposals made by the committee, and would simply say that what we do in fact propose is to go back to the Revolution Settlement, and abolish the Act of Queen Anne, which has been the cause of these secessions. We proceed on the truest principles of reform, I think, by taking what Bunsen calls the historical principle; we go back to the germ of the institution; and though some of us may not like it, there were large elements of democracy in the original constitution of the Church of Scotland. I might wish it were otherwise, but I would rather have it, if that is the only way by which I could have an Established Church. I will not trespass further except to refer to two objections—the one indicated in Dr. Barty's dissent, that the measure proposed is merely to transfer the "right of the existing patrons to a small body of local patrons, while it confers on them powers more unlimited than the present patrons possess, and deprives the members of the Church of the rights and privileges which they at present enjoy." Now, I think that there is more smartness than solidity in that objection. I

think it is an axiom in every relation of life, that if you are to have full liberty, you must be prepared to some extent to submit to restraint. In these days, had it not been I knew the good constitutional tendencies of the rev. Doctor, I might have presumed, from the last part of this, that he was rather going to turn our flank, to leave us in the valley, and appear himself as a popular leader on the heights of independence. Then I think the only other objection I would look to is one which has not been indicated to-day, but has often been stated here, and will, no doubt, be again repeated—the objection of going to Parliament. It has often been said, "Take care how you go to Parliament. You know how you go into it, you don't know how you will come out of it." (Hear.) But I think the answer to that is—You will be in Parliament whether you wish it or not. (Hear and applause.) The hon. Baronet, the member for Fifeshire, has in a friendly spirit given a notice of motion to bring us into Parliament, and Mr. McLaren has given notice of a motion in a very different spirit, which would also bring us into Parliament; and I may say that the Irish Church did not go into Parliament, but she found herself there with a vengeance. (A laugh.) I deprecate that sort of fear of Parliament. I do not see that we should be alarmed at Parliament, if it tells us that we are not what we were—we may very fairly reply that this arises from the Act of Queen Anne, from the trammels that Parliament has imposed on us, and that we may fairly ask Parliament to relieve us of these fetters. (Applause.) If we are to go into troubled waters, is it not better to go boldly in ourselves, when we may expect to some extent to guide the barque, and that it will be steered by friendly hands, than to be driven broad side by the *afflatus* of the members of Edinburgh. (Laughter.) He concluded by saying that the results were not in their hands, and if the motion was carried and the proposals carried out, the expectation was not despaired of that the great mass of the Presbyterians of Scotland might yet indeed be one. (Applause.)

Dr. PEARSON, Strathblane, said at last General Assembly three motions were made, and the one that was carried was the one that was mentioned in the report of the committee, who have prosecuted their labours, and laid the result before the General Assembly. The question, and the only question now to dispose of, is this—What are you to do with that report? Dr. Pirie has made a long speech, but it is a speech, I apprehend, very much foreign to the motion with which it concluded, and to the report that is now lying upon your table. I shall endeavour to bring you to a different conclusion from that to which Dr. Pirie would lead you, and I submit for your adoption a motion which shall bear upon the matter before us. I think it is such a motion as will tend greatly to the peace, usefulness, and prosperity of this Church. The motion I have to propose is in these terms:

"The General Assembly receive the report, and record their thanks to the convener and committee for their diligence and zeal, but in respect of the great diversity of opinion which the returns transmitted with the report show to exist in the Presbyteries of the Church both

as to the nature and extent of the evils alleged to arise from the present mode of nominating ministers to vacant charges, and the manner in which these are to be remedied; and, further, in absence of any indication of the sources from which compensation to patrons is to be derived, find that there does not exist any reasonable prospect of a speedy or more satisfactory settlement of the question by the Legislature, and that the continued agitation of it in these circumstances is unwise and inexpedient."

In reference to the report, I may briefly state that it is altogether beyond the terms of the remit. After referring to several other objections, Dr. Pearson said—<sup>r</sup> have another objection to this report, but this also I do not press—I merely state it. When the committee was appointed, I understood, and, I presume, the body appointing them understood, that they were to enquire and find out the sentiments prevailing in the Church respecting the matter which was to form the subject of the investigation and report. The report is not such a return; it is an expression of their own opinions, and it is a report presented by them in direct antagonism, and thrown in the very teeth of their own sentiments reported by them, and sent up by the committee. I proceed to the consideration of the report. The change in the report is of no value, and is not worthy the paper it is written upon, unless it be proceeded upon and action taken. (Applause.) The only action that can be taken upon it to give effect upon it, is to proceed to the Legislature in order that they may sanction it. Well, are we in a condition to go to the Legislature? have we the prospect of making such a case as to secure from them a favourable consideration for us, and to enable us to get from them what is proposed in this report? and if we do not get from them what is proposed in this report, we leave ourselves in their hands and at their mercy to give us anything else they may extend to us. (Hear, hear.) I suppose it is no secret that the present House of Commons is not particularly favourable to the Established Church, and that nothing but the direct urgency would entice any body of men to ask them to take cognizance of their affairs or to interfere in the administration of their affairs. Some people think it very easy. One gentleman says, in answer to queries, that the matter may be very easily obtained. The observation he makes is this—"The Crown, it is believed, would readily yield the patronage of the 290 churches of which it has the exercise. Most of the noble patrons would likely follow such an example. The 56 charges held by municipal bodies and 8 by colleges would assuredly be easily dealt with. Three distinguished noblemen, it is said, hold between them about 100 patronages, and from their known sentiments would likely agree to any reasonable arrangement whereby they might be relieved of so great trouble and so serious responsibility. Wherever compensation is asked, and good grounds shown for such claim, this must and ought to be given. The Church of Scotland will never lend itself to the very appearance of spoliation or confiscation. The people who have so nobly acted in the erection of churches free from patronage, will-

doubtless still more cheerfully raise the necessary fund to place the whole Church on the same sure basis—the warm affections of the people." (Laughter.) In order to go to Parliament with anything like a prospect of success, I apprehend that three elements must combine. The first is that we have a great grievance to complain of (Hear, hear.) The second is that we are all united not merely in the recognition of the grievance, but in the remedy—(Hear, hear)—and the third is that we we have such a fair promise of support as will justify us in placing our case in their hands. (Applause.) Now, do any of these elements appear very strongly, are they combined in our present position, and do they justify us in taking the step that must necessarily follow if this report be adopted by this Assembly? First of all, we have returns from 81 Presbyteries out of 84—scarcely a fuller return could be expected. Never in the history of the Church has there been in one year a return from so many Presbyteries to a single appeal made to them. And what is the result? Out of these 81 Presbyteries, by no computation can you make more than 16 take notice of any evils that arise out of the present law. It is true that 51 suggest that some alteration is expedient and called for, but these other Presbyteries, with the exception of the 16 which I have referred to, set out with answering the question that they know of no evil within their bounds arising from the passing of Lord Aberdeen's Act. I cannot answer for their inconsequential reasoning, unless it be that restless desire for a change in the system of things when once they begin to be familiar with it and know its faults, and not the faults of others, which they were seeking to reach. Another thing is that this committee are not unanimous, or anything like it. Twenty-seven gentlemen—men worthy of the trust committed to them—who ought to have commanded, and no doubt did command, the confidence of this Church, were appointed to take charge of this matter. Of these twenty-seven gentlemen when this report was agreed upon, only seventeen were present. Of these seventeen three dissented, leaving this report as the report of fourteen of the original twenty-seven members. Not merely that; but of these fourteen members there are some, as I have already said, that go directly in the teeth of the report itself. One is for popular election, giving the patron a little time in order that he may revise his rights in the event of them not agreeing. Another is disposed merely to go into it because there is a chance of making peace; and a third proposes to append to this report another recommendation or enactment which will surprise some of you when your attention is called to it. I charge no man with inconsistency. I mention this not for the purpose of barring charges of this kind, but I mention this for the purpose of showing that deliberate, that consistent, or that firm conviction that ought to prevail in the committee if they expect the Assembly to adopt this report, either as to the evil adduced or the remedy to be met with. Well, sir, they not merely examine the Presbyteries, but they send out returns to 400 elders, and these 400 elders have showed, if anything can show, the lack of interest they take in the matter. Of 400, only

67 returns are made, but the other 333 take no notice whatever of the communication made to them. Well, sir, do these 67 agree in the view they take of the matter and the remedy they propose? Why, never was in the compass of so few pages such a diversity of opinion as prevailed in these returns. It would astonish every one who read them, and if the 333 had returned in the like spirit, I would have defied any one in this Assembly to extract from them anything like order and regularity. Of returns sent to 240 patrons, 35 gave an opinion upon it. Dr. Pirie said that the patrons have been hearty on this subject, and of the 35 who have made returns, 21, or three-fifths, agree to a modification of patronage.—

Dr. Pirie—I said those who gave reports.

Dr. Pearson—Yes; out of the 35 who gave reports, 21, or three-fifths, agree to a modification of patronage.

Dr. Pirie—It is all wrong. (Laughter.)

Dr. Pearson—I have a very good memory, but to prevent the possibility of being in error I will read it from the report. After reading the extract from the report, Dr. Pearson said—I say now the truth is, 14 patrons holding 25 patronages express themselves as opposed to any change in the law. You have three-fifths who express themselves as favourable to the modification, and two-fifths that are opposed. But, sir, the committee have not told us the modification these three-fifths are prepared for, and, for all I know, or for any evidence that lies on the table of the House, if you go to Parliament with this report, and ask them to legislate upon it, these twenty-one patrons may say it is not the modification they approve of. We have no evidence of what modification they approve of, but two-fifths of the whole are opposed to any change in the state of matters. Now, with such a divided state of opinion as this on the part of the committee, on the part of the Presbyteries, on the part of the lay elders, and on the part of the patrons, would it not be—were I to use a word that was severely denounced yesterday morning—like insatiation on our part to ask Parliament to legislate on the matter? Then the next point is that you propose to raise money to buy the patronages. Well, sir, this has been tried before and failed. It was tried in 1690. Twenty-two years had the people a right to purchase the patronages of the parishes of Scotland, and during that twenty-two years only four made purchase. One paid the money to wrong parties, and lost both their cash and their rights, and the other—and I beg Dr. Pirie to notice this—was so dilatory in paying the money that the purchase was not completed until after the restoration of patronage in 1772, and all that now stand in possession are two parishes. In more modern times the attempt had been made. An anti-patronage society was formed in this city in order that the patronages as they came into the market might be bought up, and I understand they purchased two—one in Lothian, and another in Fife. I cannot speak very well of the one in Lothian, but I can almost vouch for accuracy with regard to the one in Fife. The society offered the people there the right to acquire it themselves, and with this view they placed at the door of the church a plate to re-

ceive the freewill offerings of the people, in order to buy it, and after a series of years—and this is the point on which I may be inaccurate—I cannot tell whether it was 13s. 6½d. or 13s. 8d. that was collected. (Laughter.) It was either the one or the other. Now, sir, it is alleged that evils have arisen out of the present system of nominating to vacant charges, and I am very far from denying that evils have risen and may rise out of that system. It is a system administered to by human beings, and everything of that kind has its imperfections and may give rise to evils; but I have been told—and I speak of it with all reverence as a piece of ecclesiastical history—I was told by a gentleman who long exercised his influence in the deliberations of this Church, that he had been told by his father—and I know something of it in my own experience—that there has scarcely a disturbance arisen out of such an appointment. I maintain that patronage has existed in this nation before the period of the Reformation down to the present moment, with two single intervals of eleven years and twenty-two years—making thirty-three years of an interruption during the whole of that period. Dr. Pirie has told you of 1649, and the rights of the people of that period. I have made up my mind that it was a time of considerable trouble and blasphemy, from which little can be drawn to guide us in the position in which we are placed; and having some recollection that the matter was not as he said, I applied for a copy of the Act of Assembly of that period, and I shall read it, in order that you may judge whether that statement is worthy of credit, that during that period from 1649 to 1660, the people of this country had a right to nominate to the vacant charges. Dr. Pearson read a lengthened extract from an Act of Assembly, and then said—Well, gentlemen what I maintain is this, that the election of ministers was not in the hands of the people and in the hands of the session. (Hear, hear) All historical authorities concur in that report, and any power that the Presbytery had to judge or determine was precisely that power which is given to the Presbytery under the veto and in Lord Aberdeen's Act. The election is in the one case by the session, but in the other case by the patrons, but the matter is to be tried and cognosed by the Presbytery of the bounds, and in no case whatever is the election in the hands of the people themselves. In regard to the Act of 1690, I surely do not need to say that the power was in the hands of the people. Dr. Pirie has represented it as an Act which was passed by an Administration that were resolved to trample upon the liberties of the people of Scotland. Is that consistent with the fact that for 22 years they had the power to acquire that right, and that profligate Ministry respected the rights of those who had availed themselves of that power? The two that acquired it have it still; the third that did not complete the transaction until the Act was restored, have retained that right to this day; but scarcely a vacancy has taken place in that parish that has not been the occasion of appeal to every church court for years and years. (Cries of "Name, name!") The parish of Cadder. And of every civil tribunal that can take cognizance of it. What about it in its highest and palmy days.

When the voice of the people had no say in the matter, it was the means of producing ministers and efficient elders in the Presbyterian Church, who have left an impress on the country that may be proud of them, and who are not equalled in lustre by any of these stars that may now congregate from year to year in this hall. (Laughter and applause.) If you go to Parliament on this you will introduce into Scotland the element of discord and confusion, that will show itself in petition and petition until Parliament declares that it is better, as Dr. Pirie somewhat fears, to cease the Establishment altogether. Dr. Pirie says that the people are calling—they are calling for a fish, and you offer them a stone—(Cries of Oh, oh, and applause)—you offer them the means of creating dissension in their parish—(Oh, oh)—you open up a door for the greatest jobery that can ever exist—(Oh, oh)—and you open up a door to plotting and planning with regard to assistants and successors. (Oh, oh, and applause.) After reading several extracts from the report, he said—My belief is that this is far too crotchety a scheme ever to find favour in the House of Commons, and ever to be workable, even although it was law. The House of Commons could not understand it. (Oh, oh, and laughter.) I have only one ground of hope. It is said that the Premier is greatly given to fine speculations, and it is alleged of him that he employed his leisure time in solving the schoolman's question of how many angels can dance on the point of a needle. (Great laughter.) If he should take a fancy to it from its peculiarity we cannot doubt that that large majority which has been sent to Parliament to defer to his judgment and to obey his commands will carry it through the House. When Cæsar was returning to Rome—(A laugh)—he drew up his legions on the banks of the Rubicon—his address to them was to this effect—"It is not too late to return across that stream—that narrow little stream—and the sword only can decide the contest." Adopt this motion that I have submitted, and go back to your parishes and residences in the country with a thorough resolution to abstain from the agitation, show to your people at large that the Church is satisfied in the high sense of the term; and a long career of prosperity and usefulness to the people committed to our care is before you. Adopt the resolution, and go to the House of Commons, and you will have to fight your way through that House, not for the sake of getting what you have asked at their hands, but you will fight your way through it in order that you may preserve your very existence as an Established Church. (Applause.)

Dr MacDUFF, Sandycroft, Glasgow, said—I regret much that, in occupying an humble position in this debate, I find myself at variance with those with whom it is generally my privilege to co-operate. I shall not follow my friends into the labyrinth of the historical question, nor into the labyrinth of this voluminous report, but shall content myself with recapitulating as shortly as I can the reasons I adduced when the subject was under discussion in my own Presbytery, and to which I still adhere, why I consider the raising of the present question inexpedient, untimely, unwise, and uncalled

for. (Applause.) The first reason I would assign for deprecating this movement is, that it will have a tendency to disturb the present balance in our ecclesiastical constitution, thereby hopelessly alienating from the Church the aristocracy of Scotland and the owners of the soil, and widening the existing gulf of separation between the extremes of society. We all know how deplorable that gulf of separation is. No poor words of mine can express half what I feel as to the bearings of that alienation on the welfare of the country, and if I briefly allude to this matter now, you will immediately see that in doing so I am not travelling away from the subject under discussion. I have no quarrel with Episcopacy in itself. I give no deliverance whatever on the relative claims of Presbytery and Prelacy. I claim divine right for neither. (Applause.) I repudiate the arrogance of such claims in the case of either. I love Episcopacy in England where it is the accredited national form of worship, and where it is best adapted to the tastes of the people. I have worshipped at her altars. I have partaken of her communion. I admire and venerate her great writers both living and dead. I believe I am not unwarranted in adding that some of her most distinguished clergymen and dignitaries, whose names are amongst us as household words, entertain the kindest feelings for our national Church. (Loud applause.) I love, on the other hand, Presbyterianism in Scotland, because, while we believe it to be founded on the Word of God, it also is most in accordance with our historic habits and national feelings and characteristics. So much so, that the attempt to impose Episcopacy upon our middle and lower classes (according to the proselytising efforts of some very short-sighted and impolitic men) is utterly and entirely impossible. (Cheers.) And what is the result of these proselytising efforts? Why, that a disruption more lamentable far than that to which we apply the word is growing in dimension and formidableness every year—a disruption, the miserable outgrowth of pride, and the worst form of pride, the pride of rank, and of would-be rank—a disruption between the rich and the poor—a disruption against which the highest lady of the land has uplifted her emphatic protest. (Cheers.) Moderator, do we desire by the step we are counselled to take to day to foster and stimulate and stereotype that severance? Are we willing to incur the responsibility of helping on and perpetuating this great social wrong by sundering the few last links which bind the historic Church of the nation to the upper classes of society, its territorial possessors. I for one cherish, what may appear to some, Utopian expectations. I for one cherish the fond and sanguine hope that our landlords and aristocracy will yet, ere it be too late, wake up to a sense of the great and grievous injustice of their present abnormal position. (Cheers.) If I thought otherwise, so much do I feel on the subject, I would despair of my country—I would despair of a house so divided against itself. At all events, to put it no more strongly, I would do nothing (as tampering with the existing rights of patrons unquestionably would do) to increase the irritation. Make the declaration that our Church is henceforward to be congregational

and democratic, and you cut off the last bridge. The gulf I have spoken of should by no means be considered insuperable. But depend upon it, an anti-patronage manifesto is not the Quintus Curtius that will close it. (Laughter and applause.) Before adverting to another ground, allow me one passing word, although perhaps unnecessary, on the report as to the proposed constitution of the board. Moderator, I know not what to make of the meaning of this recommendation. The numerical interpretation of that constitution is a puzzler to myself and to all with whom I have spoken. It is evidently purposely left vague—enigmatical—what mathematicians call an indeterminate quantity. (Laughter.) The report in this respect reminds me of the concluding words in a line of Virgil—  
 —“informe, ingens, cui lumen ademptum.”

It surely never, however, can be understood for one moment as proposing to transfer the right of patronage into the hands of merely three individuals or delegates. Rest assured, such a petty instalment as this would never be accepted. It would be asking bread, and giving a stone. It would be an insult alike to patron and people. (Applause.) As my old neighbour and friend Dr. Barty well says in his reasons of dissent recorded in the report—“It is inconceivable that the measure recommended should meet the alleged evils of the existing law and practice, and accomplish the objects which seem to be desired, the measure merely providing for the transference of the rights of the existing patrons to a small body of local patrons; while it confers on them powers more unlimited than the present patrons possess, and deprives the members of the Church of the rights and privileges they now enjoy.” I take it, therefore, for granted that this triple board, translated into plain and intelligible language, means the voice not of units, nor of tens, but of hundreds; the voice either of the congregation *in toto*, or expressed by a large section of it. In other words, to use the current and hackneyed phrase, a greater infusion of the popular element. This being the only possible, feasible, practicable solution of their recommendation, I pass to another ground on which I deem the present movement inexpedient and undesirable—viz., that by infusing more of this popular element you will not raise the pulpit and ministerial standard. I do not speak of the likelihood that thereby our probationers would deteriorate in social status, and be drawn from an humbler rank than at present, although this would be an almost inevitable consequence; but I speak of a deterioration in higher and truer qualities and qualifications. You would run the tremendous risk of resolving all ministerial gifts into the one of pulpit declamation. Even now, I ask, is it not often—too often—the case that young men, by a most cruel and objectionable system of competition and candidature, are not only pitted against one another, but without almost any enquiry either into their antecedents or consequents, the ministerial well-being, the lifelong interests of a parish, are perilled on that one day's exhibition. Let congregational election, be it in a modified and restricted form, become the accepted law of the Church, and, far more so than now, would the

man of rhetorical flourishes and histrionic effects and muscular Christianity—(Laughter)—the man whom, as I mentioned when debating this subject in the lower Court, I remember Dr. Chalmers, in one of his inimitable strokes of sarcasm, calling by the appropriate name of a “pulpiteer”—I say such would gain the day, in preference to the one of calm, earnest, unobtrusive character and piety; not demonstrative, perhaps, in the pulpit, but demonstrative in the hearts and homes of his people. (Applause.) And I would just further add when on this point, that a presentee is most independent when he enters on his work, not the obliged nominee of his congregation, but with his hands untied and his lips unfettered. I would not put it so strongly as a rev. prelate in the sister Church the other day, that such a people’s presentee runs the great risk of having the Scripture picture reversed, by becoming a Paul trembling before Felix; but I, at all events, say, that in many cases there would be a very strong temptation to say smoother things to Felix and perhaps the still stronger temptation to say smoother things to Drusilla. (Great laughter.) Then I pass to another important view—What would be the practical working of popular or congregational or committee election, by whatever modest modification our friends aim at? I believe it would come to be proved anything but a boon. It would come to be the fruitful cause of cabals and heartburnings and misunderstandings. I believe many an honest Christian man would be heard to avow, “Would we had been saved these miserable squabbles by the good old way, with all its alleged grievances and defects.” Moderator, divided responsibility is never satisfactory, whether in religious matters or in worldly matters—whether in the working of Church Committee or in railway directorates. (“Hear, hear,” and laughter.) And that is true, even where you have unmistakable individual ability and earnestness. I would leave safe to the unbiassed judgment of one man what would be strangled and mangled by being left to the tender mercies of a dozen; and this would be pre-eminently so in the divided responsibility of a Church election. Have we no illustrations of the truth of what I say, even when such an election takes place under the most favourable circumstances? I am sure I desire to wound the feelings of none by adducing as a pertinent example the case of a congregation in which I feel the deepest interest—a congregation which may well command, as it deserves, the profoundest respect from every wellwisher of the Church, as it is, *facile princeps*, at the head of all in its munificent liberality. I refer to Park Church in Glasgow—a Church regarding which others of us at the west end of that city are glad and willing to say, in the words of Jonathan to David, “Thou shalt be king, and I shall be next to thee.” (Great laughter.) But you will see, while I pay this sincere tribute, I am preparing the sledge-hammer. Moderator, as is well known, a lamented vacancy took place there well on to a year ago—

Dr. CHARTERS—Six months.

Dr. MACDUFF—Six months, is it? Well, it comes to the same thing. It does not affect

what I am about to say. (Laughter.) The election of a successor was congregational, and that election might with confidence have been looked to as a triumphant and crowning vindication of the system which our friends are advocating. You had in their committees and sub-committees every representative of Glasgow intelligence and worth. You had long-headed lawyers, and hard-headed merchants, and broad-headed professors—(Laughter)—every type of human and electoral sagacity. (Renewed laughter.) And what was the result? Why, I shall say no more than this, that many of them were beginning amid the troublous billows to cast a longing eye towards the quiet haven of a *jus devolutum*; and had it not been for a beacon timeously hoisted somewhere near the old Palace of Linlithgow, that noble barque might have been by this time hopelessly wrecked on the sunken reefs of popular election. I shall not pursue the *à fortiori* argument. I can only say, when we see such results where we might well look for the ideal of success and perfection, what, I ask, would be the frequent results in the case of our country parishes, or, above all, in that peculiar confederation known by the term of a weaving village? (Laughter.) And then, I repeat, though our friends speak of a modified system, depend upon it you cannot end there. It is unmistakably the thin end of the wedge. There are voices potential in this Church, from their just, social, and material influence, who would go much farther than the furthest that popular election now contemplates, who have avowed their desire to give the people the power not only of nomination but of summary dismissal, who would abolish in the case of the clergymen life tenures, and inaugurate a system of periodical re-election. I say, who would like thus to be dependent on popular caprice? Who, among our friends on the other side, would care from time to time to have the roll thus called and votes marked? (Applause.) I have already detained the House too long; but I pass to one other view of the question, that which has been referred to today, and will doubtless be often referred to in the subsequent debate—the hope of union with other Presbyterian bodies. God knows how I long for that union. It has been the dream of years and the prayer of years. I do not know what I would not give and not sacrifice to see Scotland restored in faith to its grand old historic unity; and many friends alike in the Free and United Presbyterian Church will bear witness to my sincerity. (Applause.) But, sir, while I say this, I would say, also, that unity may be too dearly purchased. I would rather far have a hearty and frank co-operation than an unhearty and equivocal incorporation. I would rather far have boundaries and principles sharply and honestly defined than be set adrift on the *mare magnum* of what are called open questions—a union where the voice is the voice of Jacob, but the hands are the hands of Esau. (Laughter)—a union which, like all ill-assorted matches, would lead sooner or later to divorce and disruption. (Renewed laughter.) If I enjoy the blessing of honest freedom, and if I feel that that freedom would by an artificial union be clogged and compromised, the blessing of Joseph with its nominal drawbacks would

be preferable to the other, even though it be the blessing of him who is still separated from his brethren. (Laughter and applause.) Then I ask in all deference, would the alteration in the law of patronage—were this obtained and ratified, would this satisfy, would this propitiate our Dissenting brethren, and bring us back again to one fold? I trow not. Our friends here on the other side have now been ventilating this question year after year. It is no secret in the two other camps. Free Churchmen and United Presbyterians have had their eyes duly directed to the unfurled banner. I ask, with what success? Our friends here have cast their line baited with anti-patronage. Have they got so much as one nibble? (Laughter.) The Elijahs of our Church have sent their messengers to the brow of Carmel to see if they can descry so much as a little cloud like a man's hand, but the answer is, "There is nothing." They have neither peeped nor muttered. It reminds us of the scene depicted by our own great dramatist. But in the present case only one of three weird sisters is heard saying, "When shall we three meet again?" The other two do not condescend on a reply. They maintain a portentous silence. (Great laughter.) Or, if the House will permit one other illustration. It is suggested by the astronomical debate of the other day. We have here a constellation of three stars in our northern ecclesiastical firmament. One of these has contracted, or is contracting, a habit of winking and twinkling to its two stellar brethren. But there are no responsive winkings on the part of the other two. They take no notice. They only sing in sarcastic duet, at the expense of the winker, classic words, with which we have been familiar from childhood:—

"Twinkle, twinkle little star,  
How we wonder what you are?"

(Much laughter and continued cheers.) We would have expected Free Churchmen and United Presbyterians by this time, had they really been desirous of any such union, that they would have cheered on their allies in this House; that their words would have been—"God speed you in your glorious struggle!—Proclaim your anti-patronage manifesto!—Fling open your anti-patronage doors and we shall be back, every one of us; not a hoof shall be left behind!" (Laughter.) Do they say so? No; they tell you that, unless you rewrite the history of the ten years' conflict, and have spiritual independence in their own interpretation of it emblazoned on your banner, they will not listen to you; and that so long as your trumpet gives forth an uncertain sound on this, not one of them will prepare themselves as confederates to join you in the battle. (Applause.) So that the results of the abolition or modification of patronage would be like the threatened results of the Prime Minister's Irish policy, which, while it has failed to conciliate and propitiate the Roman Catholic, has disaffected and disorganised the Protestant. (Hear.) In England, our Presbyterian friends are riper and readier for union. I would have hopes—sanguine hopes—of them, but not on this side the Tweed. I tell you honestly I

would have more hope here of Episcopalian lairds and an Episcopalian aristocracy than of Free Churchmen and United Presbyterians. ("cries of "Oh, oh.") But no—I say No, and I give emphasis to the No—I will not despair. And because it is that I do not despair in seeing Scotland one again in ecclesiastical polity and worship that I take this day what may be called an obstructive, but which is a true conservative position. It is because I do not despair that I would advocate the safe *via media*, maintaining and upholding things as they are, and, in simple homely phrase, letting well alone. I would counsel this *via media*, because, dearly though I should like to see us as one with the other Presbyterian bodies, I confess I would have an equal—I dare not, perhaps, say a stronger desire to have the aristocracy and upper classes once more the upholders and champions of their country's unity—because I would like once more to hear the village church-bell summoning them, as it did their fathers before them, from their baronial or castle hall to the same humble sanctuary with their lowliest dependents—to join in the same confessions, to listen to the same immortal truths, to be animated with the same immortal hopes—ay, to take their turn by the church-door in receiving the offerings for God's poor, and give their younger sons, with grace in their hearts, to the office of God's ministry. (Applause.) Not as it now is, when that bell is rather the signal for departure, in pomp of equipage, to the near or distant town, as may be, meeting the stream of humble worshippers from distant hamlet or glen—virtually proclaiming that there is one church for the great, and another for the lowly—one for Dives, another for Lazarus—one for the centurion, another for his servant. (Applause.) That desirable consummation will not be obtained by sanctioning and abetting a democratic movement and severing the sole remaining bond of union. Let us have back the upper ten thousand, and then would follow the severed million, and Scotland would be Scotland again. (Applause.) Let the wave of secession, that has spent itself, return into the bosom of its parent wave, and with united force let them gather themselves up, anew to dash their full strength against Popery and Infidelity. For who can deny that this national division and disorganisation is all the sadder when we witness the calm, steady, swiftness, yet sure progress and pretensions of a wittier foe, who is in our midst—the Church of Rome with its boasted unity? The march to archiepiscopal thrones with silver croziers is made easier and more triumphant through the battling ranks of divided Protestants, wasting their strength in petty skirmishes, while the gigantic powers of evil are thundering at our gates. I would close with the picture—the graphic picture which Lord Cockburn in that most interesting book, "The Memorials of His Time," gives of the General Assembly of former days. "There," he says, "the clergy and the laity were combined into one brave and animated mass, where it was deemed an honour for the best of the gentry either to lead or to follow." Moderator, is that only a record of the past, or is it a prophecy of the future? Oh, would to God we

could have the like times back again, when the peace and prosperity of the Church would be reflected upon the usages, and our land, like the House of Obededom, would be blessed for the Ark's sake! (Loud and prolonged applause.)

Mr. JAMESON, Old Machar, said that if the debate was to go on according to what he would style the declamatory harangues to which they had just listened (Hisses—)

The MODERATOR—I beg to say, once for all, that I do not think you pay any very great compliment to the Church, if you think that any of the ministers or elders belonging to it should be hissed at. (Applause.)

Mr. JAMESON said he was afraid that, at all events, if they were to go on according to the style they had listened to, they would lose sight of the real question. What was now before them was clearly to look to the character of the times—to the taste for and tendency towards popular election that existed in a large measure now in the appointment of ministers to their various charges. He would call upon them to address their attention to this particular circumstance, that it was a mere matter of this feeling *per se*—in and by itself. The feeling might exist in the corporate community. These impulses, feelings, or cravings arose in our own individual personality; and it came to be a question for them to consider whether this feeling had arisen of itself, and whether, in yielding to it, they are compromising any principle, sacrificing any truth; whether they were doing injury to the body corporate or body ecclesiastical? He apprehended that the question before them was not now the consideration as to how that feeling, that craving, on the part of a large portion of the community had arisen. It was sufficient for them to know that it actually existed; and on that point he desired to direct their attention. The stone that was gently dropped from a mountain's brow would by-and-by acquire a velocity and momentum that came to be excessive and extreme ere it reached the mountain's base, if it was not regulated, restrained, or in some way directed. But if they interposed any obstacle, what would be the consequence? Very possibly it would cause to be created an eccentric tendency, and the stone to leap upon the rocks beneath where it would dash itself to pieces. (Applause and laughter.) He would not have originated such a movement as was now existing in the Church. He was one of those who was satisfied with things as they were, more especially looking to the fact that patrons were anxiously and earnestly endeavouring to discharge their duty. But they should apply themselves to the question that had been brought before them now that the movement had been originated. They were now told that it was an inherent, an essential right and prerogative of the people to elect their own minister—that the same individual presented to a charge by a patron would not be regarded in the same light as if that same individual had been chosen by the congregation themselves; and it was also asked if, when the franchise was given to the people in the civil community, the ecclesiastical franchise should not be given to the ecclesiastical community? He was one of those that believed that they must accept the position of things as they found them, and look

them fairly in the face—(Interruption)—and he did not think they could by any nominal effort, repress the opinion that was at present existing on this subject. In support of the view he had stated as to the extent of the movement against patronage, he referred to the statement in the report that 51 Presbyteries had stated they desired to see some change or modification introduced, while only 23 desired that the whole subject should remain in *statu quo*. (Interruption.) A great deal had been said about the heterogeneous nature of the recommendations in the report, but he maintained that throughout the details it was seen that there was at least one principle embodied in them—that there should be at least an imitation in the matter of the popular election of ministers.—

Mr. OLIPHANT, Anstruther, elder—I have no desire to interrupt the speaker, but really we do not know what he is speaking about. (Applause.)

The MODERATOR—You know we have till breakfast time to-morrow. (Laughter.)

Mr. JAMESON—Then, I will just read my motion—“That this Church, having before it the results of the enquiry instituted by the Committee on Patronage among the Presbyteries of the Church and its elders, affirms and supports the principle of at least popular representation in the appointment of ministers to vacant benefices; constitute a committee to correspond with the interested and influential parties, especially with the patrons of livings, to ascertain by what processes and under what conditions such principle can be practically carried into effect throughout the Church, and to report to next General Assembly.” If they agreed to this motion they would have no occasion to go to Parliament at the present time. He would not in the present circumstances go to Parliament. They all knew that Parliament in the present circumstances were not favourable to the principle of an establishment. The Parliament which now existed was very different from that Parliament which originally established the Church of Scotland. The principles upon which the establishment was originally founded were not the principles on which an establishment would now be founded. He therefore would propose to have further intercourse with the patrons themselves. He would consult the patrons, and seek to ascertain under what circumstances the patrons would be willing to grant either a modification of the law, or to give up their patronage altogether. (Applause.)

The motion was not seconded.

Dr. WALLACE said.—The motion that I have to make is to the following effect:—“The General Assembly having considered the report of their Committee on Patronage, approve of their diligence in collecting information, express their sense of the value of their deliberations, and record their thanks to the committee, re-appoint them, and instruct them to prosecute their enquiries with special reference to the question whether the manner of appointing ministers can be so arranged as to reconcile civil establishment of religion with the principles of religious equality, and to report to next General Assembly.” In supporting his motion, Dr. Wallace said—I shall endeavour to be exceedingly brief, indeed, in the few remarks that I ask liberty to

make in support of that motion. I do confess that it is not a motion for which I expect a very large measure of support in this Assembly. At the same time, it is not a motion, curiously enough, which the party to whom I am most opposed in detail in this matter should necessarily find it impossible to give their countenance and support, as in some respects I think it would suit some of the ends that they would consider desirable; but it is a motion which, if lost, will put me in the position of voting with the party that are diametrically opposed to them. Although there are three motions before the House, there are only two practical ideas before you. (A laugh.) I mean to cast no disrespect on the motion of the gentleman who spoke before me, but his motion and the first one are the same in spirit, and point to the same practical end. Necessarily I differ from those who want to do nothing on the simple ground that they do want to do nothing. I think that something should be done. I differ from the party who are willing to do something because I think the something they propose to do is not enough. The cause of the whole of our discussion, it seems to me, arises out of what I venture to call an undeniable fact—namely, that the Church of Scotland, as at present constituted, is in danger of its existence from the fact that it is not in many of its features in harmony with the spirit of the age. I am not going to describe at large the spirit of the age. (Laughter.) I shall only condescend to that feature of it that is relevant to the present discussion, and to my own purpose; and I think I am perfectly safe in asserting that the spirit of the present age is a democratic and levelling spirit. My reverend brother from Glasgow may lament greatly the fact that the ascendancy of the democratic order is not what he would desire to see it. Perhaps, in the abstract, I might be inclined to agree with him so far if a discussion of that kind were originated: but it would seem to me altogether a barren discussion, because the fact seems to me that the spirit of the age is essentially a levelling spirit. It is a spirit that is intolerant of all monopoly or privilege, and in church matters it is a spirit which demands religious equality—which insists that there shall be no special system that is favoured by the law over another system. Now, I ask, are there any elements in the Church of Scotland that are in direct antagonism with that spirit? There are various features of monopoly and privilege connected with it, both in its internal relations between its own members, and also in its external relations towards the rest of the national life. And when I put to myself the question, is it possible for these monopolies to be maintained in presence of the spirit of the times, I feel myself, whether I like it or no, compelled to come to the conclusion that they cannot stand. Well, this matter of patronage is one of those monopolies. It is a privilege possessed by one member of a community to the exclusion of other members of the community, who feel that there are no reasons why they themselves should not share in the privilege. This is one of what I may call the private monopolies that are connected with the Church of Scotland; and if you ask me whether I believe it is possible to maintain this monopoly—I do not

enter into the question whether it is a good arrangement or a bad arrangement—I feel myself driven to the conclusion that it is not possible; and that it is inevitable, if you are to preserve the existence of the establishment—if you are to defend it from perishing through internal decay and explosion—that you should give to the people the management of their own affairs. (Loud applause.) Make what arrangements you choose—invent the best machinery you can in order to protect yourselves from the evils that are incidental to popular election, as there are evils incidental to all possible appointments—still it seems to me that the principle of popular election is one that is inevitable, and must be conceded if you are to perpetuate the existence of your Established Church. Therefore, I feel myself utterly unable to agree with the views of my rev. father who made the second motion; for, although all the length he went was to say that it was not desirable in present circumstances to continue the agitation, I am entitled to draw this inference, that he thinks that it is possible to continue the existence of the Establishment without that thing for which the other party are agitating. Now, I cannot help feeling that he and those who sympathise with him are mis-representing entirely the signs of the times. I should not like to use strong and pointed language in characterising this view taken by so many reverend fathers and brethren. Remembering that already I have been reminded by a gentleman who is not willing that a spade should be called a spade, but that it should, if possible, be designated, I suppose, an agricultural implement, in criticising the view of my rev. father I hope on this occasion I shall not ruffle his elegant susceptibilities. I venture to say his view of the matter is distinguished by wisdom so elevated that it has altogether disappeared from the range of my vision. (Laughter.) I sympathise so far with the views taken by my rev. father from the University of Aberdeen, who made the first motion. But when I come to examine his proposition more carefully, I do not find that it is entirely satisfactory. I admit that it saves the Church from self-destruction: but does it save the Church from that destruction which threatens it from without? Does it answer the demand for religious equality that comes from them? I cannot say that to any appreciable extent it does satisfactorily answer that question. The adherents of the Established Church in any parish may no doubt be made more abundantly content with their Church if they have the election of their minister in their own hands; but I ask, will the dissenting population be in any respect better pleased with this internal reform that you make? Will it reconcile them to that distinction of privilege—to that distinction of monopoly—which is a grievance lying on their minds at this time, and the cause of the irritation that is dangerous to the existence of our Church? I believe it will have no effect whatsoever in allaying the danger that threatens us from without. Nay, I am not sure that it may not aggravate that danger. For I am not quite sure that one of the things, the existence of which makes the dissenting population extend to us even the little amount of toleration that they do, is that they think the want of free

action and the want of the power of popular election is a sort of tell-off to the freedom which they themselves enjoy in that matter. And if you put the State Church precisely on a level with themselves in the matter of popular election, I maintain, so far as that goes, you will aggravate rather than allay the dissatisfaction that is in their mind. I know that my friends tell me that they expect that by the action of popular election they will attract so many dissenters into the fold of the Church that the voice of the demand, or religious equality will become practically inaudible and insignificant. I wish I could agree with them, in that expectation; but I entirely agree with my brother from Glasgow in believing that the giving of popular election to the churches of the Establishment will not produce any appreciable effect whatever upon the attitude and the influence of the Free Church and of the United Presbyterian Church. (Hear, hear.) At least it will not produce that modification of their influence or position in sufficient time to stave off the danger which you fear, and which has been the cause of your entering into any enquiry and agitation on this matter. You may ask me, if that be my view of the matter, what is it that I propose to do in order to silence the demand for religious equality that comes from without? I can see nothing for it except simply to push out to its logical termination the principle that you have already carried so far—namely, to give to the whole inhabitants of a parish the same rights that you now propose to confer upon merely the Established Church section of the population. I ask, Why not start the idea of committing the election of parish ministers to a board selected for the purpose out of the whole of the enfranchised parishioners? (A laugh.) That would silence and answer the demand for religious equality; for, make the parish minister the officer of the whole community, and then it is perfectly impossible that his existence could be a grievance to any individual within it. Now, of course, I know very well that many will tell me that this is entirely a Utopian and visionary project: that it is so surrounded by difficulties that it is unworthy altogether to be entertained. I admit that there are many difficulties with it, but, thinking over it maturely, I have not been able to satisfy myself that these difficulties are insurmountable. I admit, for example, one necessary condition to any such measure as this would be to alter the relations of the public teacher of religion to creeds and to subscription of creeds; because, if once you make it accessible, if once you make it possible for the whole community within a parish to be free to select whatever religious instructor they desire, you cannot tie them down to any one particular or favourite creed or system of dogmas. In short, sir, I admit that the idea I put before you is necessarily connected with something like the liberation of theological teaching. But, while admitting that, and allowing that it is a difficulty, I am not prepared to assume that it is either an insurmountable difficulty, or that it is a great disadvantage, for I am one of those who believe that the emancipation of theological teaching from penal restrictions is an advantage to the community, and that there is a possibility of inventing various moral restraints instead of penal

restraints to act as a regulating influence upon the vagaries of mere individual speculation. And I am also of opinion that there is rapidly approaching a change in the attitude of our Christian Churches towards their creeds and subscriptions to them. I think I see many signs round about me in the ecclesiastical horizon that are harbingers of such a transformation. To go no further than our Church, no later than yesterday, this venerable House, by an overwhelming majority, expressed its unqualified and enthusiastic confidence in a Church whose constitution expressly provides freedom to any of its clergy or other members to teach the theologies either of Dr. Pusey or of Mr. Ryle, Mr. Jowett, Dr. Rowland Williams, or even the Bishop of Natal himself. (Laughter.) In an Assembly with such an opinion as this—(Oh, oh, hisses, and cheers)—in an Assembly that has stamped the principle of comprehensiveness in the way that this Assembly has stamped it, I think that I may be pardoned for believing that it is no great blemish upon the proposition I make, that it has a tendency to encourage the liberation of theological teaching. (Hisses.) Then I shall be told, of course, that the scheme is impractical on this very ground, that you will never be able to carry the people along with you. (Hear, hear.) But the people can be taught. It has been suggested to me that they can be "educated." (A laugh.) The jest is hardly worth repeating. If the thing be true in itself—if the thing be reasonable in itself—all that is wanted to carry reasonable people along with you is sufficient pains taken—sufficient perseverance taken—by those who believe in the idea themselves. I shall be told that the proposition is revolutionary. I admit that it is revolutionary. It alters essentially the mode of constituting the relationship between the Church and the State. It amounts to an affirmation of the principle of an indirect establishment of religion instead of a direct and explicit one; and I admit that that is a revolution in ecclesiastical history. But, sir, I have two answers to that, and the first of them is that we are living in revolutionary times—times of quiet too, and favourable to very swift revolutions. And, sir, revolutionary dangers are only to be met by revolutionary remedies; and it has always been the case in the history of nations, of churches, and communities, that when they have been bold enough to adopt the true and only rational safeguards they have been protected; but when they had not courage to believe in the thing they saw to be rational, and shrunk from it because they thought it impracticable and Utopian, they have gone down, and the world has had to wait for many generations until the proper thing was done that should have been done long before. I have one other answer to this objection, and it is this, that although the practical scheme which I have the boldness, possibly the hardihood, to submit to the Assembly, is the one which seems to me the simple and rational working out of the conception of religious equality as applied to the State's functions in religious teaching, that is not by any means the only way of working out the idea. There are half a dozen ways of working out an idea at the very least; (Hear, hear.) and there may be many schemes that could be

prop'ed for the purpose of giving efficacy to something like that religious equality without which all attempts to save your Church will prove to be abortive. There is what we might call the scheme of affiliation. I may be driven of course to a *pis aller*—I do not see that I would be driven to it—but if driven to it, I would not have the slightest objection. I really have no objection, where the majority should prove to be Free Church, that they for the time being, so long as they were in that majority—should possess the emoluments—(Hisses, and Hear, hear)—and still remain in connection with their Church, and have guaranteed to them the free exercise of those practices, and of the teaching of those doctrines which were congenial to them. I would not have the slightest difficulty in any parish where the United Presbyterians were the majority—for voluntarism was not a term of communion in that Church—that they should also exercise the same privilege. Then there is what may be the denominational school way—

Principal CAMPBELL—What would you do with the Roman Catholics? (Applause.)

Dr. WALLACE—Oh, I am not afraid to carry out my principle, Principal Campbell, in its full application; but I do not want to enter into details, as it would detain the House. (Laughter.) I could defend it, but I don't wish to shrink from the statement of my principle. I simply wish to explain what my view is, and not in any way to attempt to demonstrate it. (Laughter and cries of Oh, oh!) There is what may be also called the denominational method of carrying out the idea of religious equality—the same method that you propose to apply in the case of denominational schools, and there are many and various other methods of working out the conception of religious equality. I have only explained my meaning in bringing forward this motion. As I stated before, I do not see why the party that my brother from Glasgow has called the obstructive party should not support the motion in point of form, because the motion does not contain my explanations, and there may be various reasons for supporting the same motion; and very often when people come from opposite points of the compass, they meet at the same place. (A laugh.) But I am by no means anxious for their support. I may say that I hardly expect to receive any support for this motion at all within this House (Hear, hear, and laughter.) But sir, I am well aware that the ideas which I have very imperfectly attempted to express will find sympathy elsewhere, and in quarters that are quite as influential as the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland. (Laughter and loud hisses.) The course, therefore, that I shall pursue will be to vote for the motion of the rev. Doctor from Aberdeen, because I believe that he proposes a useful internal reform, and one that will do good so far as it goes, although I am not of opinion that it will to any material extent rescue the Church from the danger which threatens it from without. (Applause and hisses.)

Some time having elapsed without any one rising to second the motion, a conversation took place as to whether this motion and that of Dr. Jamieson's should be recorded. Several

members held that the motions should be allowed to drop, and others that they should be entered on the record with the statement that they were not seconded. It was agreed to adopt the latter course.

After several other speakers addressed the assembly the vote was taken with the result mentioned in last number.

The General Assembly of the Church of Scotland resumed its sittings May 27th—the Rev. Dr. Norman Macleod, Moderator.

Principal CAMPBELL, in the absence of Dr. Liddel, gave in a report by the Committee on Fast Days, with the following recommendations:—“1. That the Fast Day be kept, where practicable, on the Friday; and where this is impracticable, brought as near as possible to the Lord's Day, for services of which it is intended as a preparation. 2. That the Fast (and consequently the communion) be observed on the same day throughout Presbyteries, counties, or other large districts, so as to lessen as much as possible the inconveniences resulting from the keeping of the Fast on different days in contiguous parishes, and the temptation to wander on that day from one parish to another, and to go from town to country, or *vice versa*. 3. That, to facilitate this system, the custom be encouraged of ministers occupying their own pulpits on the Fast Day, thereby preparing their own flocks for the solemn service; and, also, where the same is attainable and expedient, adopting the practice of simultaneous communion.” Mr. Steel, Dumbarton, moved a resolution, recommending the suggestions to the favourable consideration of ministers and kirk-sessions. Provost Dykes, Lanark, seconded the motion; which, after some discussion, was agreed to.

Dr. WATSON, Dundee, submitted the report of the India Mission, and he dwelt at some length on the principal features of the missionary field in India. The Moderator, having left the chair, addressed the Assembly on behalf of the claims of India on the Christians of this country, and the necessity for contributing liberally to the scheme. He stated that in the Moderator's chair that day he had received a letter from a Free Churchman, enclosing an order for £100 towards the fund. On the motion of Mr. Robertson, Greenock, seconded by Sir Robert Anstruther, a deliverance was adopted commending the mission to the sympathies, the prayers, and the enlarged liberality of the Church.

A deputation from the Scottish Synod in England then addressed the Assembly. They asked that the missionary work in England should be connected with one of the schemes of the Church, such as the Colonial or Home Mission Scheme. The Moderator, on behalf of the Assembly, thanked the deputation, and expressed his satisfaction at meeting Presbyterian brethren so closely connected with the Church of Scotland. He was not prepared to say in what form a union between the Church in this country and the Synod in England might be rendered closer, but a committee would be appointed to consider the subject.

The General Assembly of the Church of

Scotland resumed its sittings May 28th—Dr. Macleod, Moderator.

The first business taken up was the consideration of the overtures in reference to patronage, which were read to the Assembly on Wednesday, when the report of the committee on patronage was laid on the table. Professor Charteris moved the dismissal of the overtures in respect that the provisions of the Barrier Act were not applicable to the resolution come to on patronage on Wednesday, and that the Assembly resolve to petition Parliament for the removal of patronage, and appoint a committee to take the necessary steps for carrying the resolution into effect, and attending to the progress of any legislative measure on the subject of patronage which may be introduced into Parliament. Mr. Baird of Cambusdoon seconded the motion. Dr. Pearson, Strathblane, said his opinion was that, although according to the strict interpretation of the Barrier Act the resolution which had been come to by the Assembly on patronage did not come within the letter of that Act, it came within the spirit of it. He moved that before petitioning Parliament the nature of the change to be asked for should be distinctly and formally stated, and remitted to Presbyteries for consideration. Dr. Craik seconded Dr. Pearson's motion. Mr. Johnstone, Harray and Birsay, who thought that what was needed was the simple repeal of the Act of Queen Anne, with the provision of due compensation for patrons, moved a long resolution for carrying out his views, but subsequently withdrew it. After a lengthened debate, the Assembly divided, when Dr. Charteris' motion was carried over Dr. Pearson's by a majority of 185 to 74. The announcement of the result was received with loud cheering. Several members entered their dissent. Dr. Charteris afterwards nominated a committee;—The Moderator and Dr. Phin, joint-conveners; Dr. Barty, Dr. Charteris, Dr. MacRae, Hawick; Principal Tulloch, Dr. Crawford, Dr. Pearson, Dr. William Smith, North Leith; Dr. Traill, Professor Mitchell, Professor Milligan, Dr. Gillan, Alford; Rev. F. L. Robertson, Greenock; Dr. Macduff, Rev. J. C. Lees, Paisley; Mr. Rankin, Muthill; the Hon. Major Baillie, Sir R. Anstruther, Bart., M.P.; Mr. Wellwood H. Maxwell, Lord Polwarth, Mr. John Tait, Mr. James Baird, Colonel Dundas, Mr. D. Milne Home, Mr. J. A. Campbell, Mr. David, Mr. Alex. Kinloch, Sheriff Barclay, Mr. E. Baxter, Mr. T. G. Murray, (vice-convener), and the procurator of the Church. I would further ask the Moderator, on the part of this Assembly, to ask the Lord High Commissioner to present our petition to the House of Lords, and that he also should ask Sir Robert Anstruther to present the petition in the House of Commons.

Drs. Barty, Craik, Pearson, and Macduff, who were put upon the list, declined to act.

Dr. Herdman, Melrose, and Mr. Steven, Montrose, were appointed to preach before the Lord High Commissioner on Sunday.

Mr. BAIN of Cambusdoon read a report by the committee appointed at last Assembly to take steps for the encouragement and increase of Gaelic-speaking students having a view to the ministry. The committee reported that

their want of success had been discouraging; and, on the motion of Mr. Macfarlane, Southend, it was agreed to discharge the committee, and, in accordance with a suggestion made in the report, to recommend Highland Synods to form bursary funds.

Mr. DAVID SMITH, W.S., laid on the table a draft of a petition to Parliament against the Edinburgh Annuity Tax Abolition Bill, and it was agreed to entrust its presentation in the House of Lords to the Lord High Commissioner, and to Mr. Maxwell of Munches in the House of Commons.

J. VERNIER, a deputy from the Central Protestant Society of France, addressed the House, and the report was subsequently given in by Mr. R. H. Stevenson of the Committee on Correspondence with Foreign Churches, which took notice of various religious bodies on the Continent with which they communicated, and the steps taken by the committee to provide services during summer for our countrymen on the Continent. A lengthened deliverance was adopted in accordance with the report.

Dr. NISBET gave in the report of the Committee on Classification of Overtures, and Mr. NIVEN, C.A., submitted the report on the Widows' Fund.

The Assembly adjourned until evening.

At the evening sederunt Professor MITCHELL gave in the report of the Committee for the Conversion of the Jews, which described the Committee's operations at considerable length. The collections for the scheme had last year reached £3440, or £83 more than in the previous year; and the total income was £4655, or £312 less than in the previous year. The expenditure was £4445, being an increase of £23 on the year. Mr. Robertson, missionary from Beyrout, addressed the Assembly, and a deliverance was adopted, on the motion of Professor Milligan, commending the work of the committee to the liberal support of the Church.

Mr. YOUNG, Monifieth, gave in the committee's report on Sabbath schools, which stated that the schools now numbered 1830; the scholars 150,000; and the teachers 13,182. The report was adopted, thanks awarded, and permission given to the committee to collect statistics in regard to adult classes for religious instruction held on week days.

It was agreed, on the recommendation of the committee appointed to confer as to the convenership of the Home Mission Committee, that Dr. Phin, Galashiels, be elected to fill the vacancy caused by the resignation of Professor Crawford.

The Assembly then adjourned until to-day.

May 29th.

The General Assembly of the Church of Scotland resumed its sitting at eleven o'clock on Saturday forenoon—Dr. Craik, Moderator, *pro tempore*.

The clerk stated he had been requested by Dr. Henry Scott to present to the General Assembly the third volume of his book, "Fasti Ecclesie Scotice," and by Dr. Crawford to present a copy of his work on "The Fatherhood of God." The Assembly agreed to accept the books, and thank the authors.

Mr. STEPHEN, Renfrew, then gave in the report.

of the Committee on the Pastoral Training of Missionaries and Ministers. Professor Milligan, in moving the adoption of the report, adverted to the importance of more attention being given to the subject, now that popular election was likely to be introduced into the Church. He concluded by moving:—“That the General Assembly receive with much interest the report of their committee on the Pastoral Training of Ministers and Missionaries, and learn from it with great satisfaction that lectures on pastoral theology are in course of being arranged for by some of the Divinity Faculties in the universities of Scotland. The Assembly agree to record their high estimate of the importance of a provision for the professional training of the ministers of this Church such as the committee have been labouring to secure; and farther resolve hereby to recommend the suggestions of the committee's report to the serious consideration of the Presbyteries of the Church, with a view to steps being every where taken for the efficient superintendence by Presbyteries of students of divinity and probationers within their bounds, in order to the cultivation of their ministerial gifts, and the training of them in the practice of their profession. The General Assembly further instruct the committee to correspond with Presbyteries, with the view of ascertaining their opinions as to the expediency of appointing separate lecturerships for the purpose of promoting pastoral training, and generally as regards the other matters referred to in this report. The General Assembly record their thanks to the convener, and through him to the committee, for their diligence, and reappoint the committee—Mr. Robert Stephen, of Renfrew, to be convener.” The deliverance was agreed to.

Dr. Cook laid upon the table a special report by the Education Committee on the bill introduced into Parliament by the Duke of Argyll for the extension of education in Scotland. He also expressed his views on the subject in a speech of considerable length. Dr. Barty moved “that the General Assembly approve of the report, deeply regret that no provision is made in the bill now before Parliament for religious instruction in the proposed new national schools, and instruct the committee to continue to direct their attention to this subject, and to the other point referred to in the report; and further, to consider, in the event of its being necessary to institute a rate in any district, how far the funds thence arising might be advantageously distributed among all the schools in that district meeting the requirements for obtaining Privy Council grants.” Provost Dykes, Hamilton, seconded the motion. Dr. Wallace moved an amendment to the effect that the Assembly express its preference for a national over a denominational system of education; approve of the bill in so far as it approximates to a national system; resolve to petition the Legislature to introduce such amendments and additions into the bill as shall be sufficient to secure the effectual operation of the national principle. Mr. Burnie, Oxnam, seconded the amendment, and after some discussion Dr. Barty's motion was carried by a large majority.

The report of the Committee on Statistics

was submitted, representing the amount of voluntary contributions raised during the year at £170,000.

#### REPORT ON HYMNS.

The next subject on the programme of business before the House was the farther consideration of the report of the Committee on Hymns. A conversational discussion took place as to whether the full consideration of the contents of the hymn-book compiled by the committee might not be delayed till next Assembly, and ultimately, in view of the heavy roll of business before the Assembly on Monday, this course was agreed to.

Dr. NISBET afterwards moved—“That the General Assembly having considered the report of the Committee on Hymns, appoint the hymn-book now laid upon the table, as amended by appendices also submitted, to be sent to the Presbyteries of the Church, in order that they may report their opinion thereon before next General Assembly; in the meantime, they allow this collection to be used in public worship where ministers find it for edification, and re-appoint the Committee—Dr. Boyd, convener.”

Another motion was proposed, to the effect “that the General Assembly instruct the committee to send a copy of the hymn-book now submitted to the clerks of the Presbyteries of the Church, in order that each Presbytery might have an opportunity of reporting their opinion on the hymn-book before next General Assembly.”

Ultimately the second motion was adopted as the deliverance of the House, without a division.

May 31st.

Dr. SMITH, North Leith, gave in the report on the Endowment Scheme. The report stated that the gross amount of funds hitherto received for the Provincial Fund was £142,994, 0s. 7d. The sums received by the general and local treasurers from May 1868 to May 1869 were as follow:—1. On account of the provincial scheme, £10,268, 3s.; 2. On account of general fund, £4690, 12s. 11d.; 3. On account of particular church, £8733, 9s. 10d.; 4. Local supplements of nine chapels endowed within the past year, £9900—total, £331,591, 16s. 9d. Nine new parishes had been added to the Church during the year. The total number of newly-endowed parishes was now increased to one hundred and forty, the erection on which has been accomplished by the free and sustained efforts of the Church, at a cost of not less than £528,000, besides the sums, in many cases considerable, expended in clearing the way for endowment by defraying debt secured on the fabrics. On the motion of Dr. Wallace, seconded by Mr. M'Murtrie, St. Bernard's, Edinburgh, the report was approved.

(The Moderator's address which followed was so admirable and well timed that rather than mutilate it we shall hold it over and give it entire in next number.)

#### LOWER PROVINCES.

UNIVERSITY OF NEW-BRUNSWICK.—The Revd Prof. Jardine, B. D., Sc. D., was selected to deliver the annual oration in honour of the founders of the College. He chose for his topic the

history and constitution of Universities, especially the British Universities, and in the course of his learned and elaborate address pointed out some defects in the organization of the University with which he is connected. The paper is a valuable contribution to the literature of the subject of which it treats, and fully sustains Prof. Jardine's reputation for clear thinking and vigorous reasoning.

**CANADA PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH**—In regard to the use of instrumental music in Knox Church Montreal, the Synod on motion of Principal Willis came to the following deliverance:

"Receive the reference, approve the conduct of the Presbytery; and, while unwilling to impute unended contumacy, regret that the Session of Knox's Church, Montreal, should have taken a position having some appearance of a disregard of the Synod's authority; declare, in case of misunderstanding on this point, that the decision leaves the constitutional law as it existed before the late discussions; and that the Presbytery was warranted in expecting of all sessions and congregations conformity to the existing order, until it should be modified or altered in due course."

#### PROPOSED REUNION OF THE OLD AND NEW SCHOOL PRESBYTERIAN CHURCHES IN THE UNITED STATES.

HE two assemblies met in New York on the 20th May, Melancthon N. Jacobus, D. D., professor of Biblical Literature in Alleghany College being elected Moderate of the old school and Rev. Dr. Fowler of Utica Moderator of the New School. After a long discussion in the two assemblies the following basis of reunion was almost unanimously adopted, the vote in the United bodies being 500 for to 8 against:

##### *Plan of Re-union of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America.*

Believing that the interests of the Redeemer's kingdom would be promoted by the healing of our divisions, and that the two bodies bearing the same name, having the same Constitution, and each recognizing the other as a sound and orthodox body, according to the principles of the Confession common to both, cannot be justified by any but the most imperative reasons in maintaining separate, and, in some respects, rival organizations; we are now clearly of the opinion that the Re-union of those bodies ought, as soon as the necessary steps can be taken, to be accomplished, upon the Basis hereinafter set forth:

1. The Presbyterian Churches in the United States of America, namely, that whose General Assembly convened in the Brick church, in the city of New York, on the 20th of May, 1869, and that whose General Assembly met in the church of the Covenant, in the same city, on the same day, shall be re-united as one Church, under the name and style of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, possessing all the legal and corporate

rights and powers pertaining to the Church previous to the division in 1838, and all the legal and corporate rights and powers which the separate Churches now possess.

2. The Re-union shall be effected on the doctrinal and ecclesiastical basis of our common Standards; the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments shall be acknowledged to be the inspired Word of God, and the only infallible rule of faith and practice; the Confession of Faith shall continue to be sincerely received and adopted as containing the system of doctrine taught in the Holy Scriptures; and the government and discipline of the Presbyterian Church in the United States shall be approved as containing the principles and rules of our polity.

3. Each of the said Assemblies shall submit the foregoing Basis to its Presbyteries, which shall be required to meet on or before the 15th day of October, 1869, to express their approval or disapproval of the same, by a categorical answer to the following question:

Do you approve of the re-union of the two bodies, now claiming the name and rights of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, on the following basis, namely:—  
"The re-union shall be effected on the doctrinal and ecclesiastical basis of our common Standards; the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments shall be acknowledged to be the inspired word of God, and the only infallible rule of faith and practice; the Confession of Faith shall continue to be sincerely received and adopted as containing the system of doctrine taught in the Holy Scriptures; and the Government and Discipline of the Presbyterian Church in the United States shall be approved as containing the principles and rules of our polity."

Each Presbytery shall, before the 1st day of November, 1869, forward to the State Clerk of the General Assembly with which it is connected, a statement of its vote on the said Basis of Re-union.

4. The said General Assemblies now sitting shall, after finishing their business, adjourn to meet in the city of Pittsburg, Pennsylvania, on the second Wednesday of November, 1869, at 11 o'clock A. M.

If the two General Assemblies shall then find and declare that the above-named Basis of Re-union has been approved by two-thirds of the Presbyteries connected with each branch of the Church, then the same shall be of binding force, and the two Assemblies shall take action accordingly.

5. The said General Assemblies shall then and there make provision for the meeting of the General Assembly of the united Church on the third Thursday of May, 1870. The Moderators of the two present Assemblies shall jointly preside at the said Assembly of 1870 until another Moderator is chosen. The Moderator of the Assembly now sitting at the Brick church, aforesaid, shall, if present, put all votes, and decide questions of order; and the Moderator of the other Assembly shall, if present, preach the opening sermon, and the Stated Clerks of the present Assemblies shall act as Stated Clerks of the Assembly of the united Church until a Stated Clerk or Clerks shall have been chosen

thereby ; and no Commissioner shall have a right to vote or deliberate in said Assembly until his name shall have been enrolled by the said Clerks, and his commission examined and filed among the papers of the Assembly.

G. Each Presbytery of the separate Churches shall be entitled to the same representation in the Assembly of the united Church in 1879, as it is entitled to in the Assembly with which it is now connected.

#### ITALY.—ROME, THE POPE, AND THE COUNCIL.—

According to directions given by the Pope, the Thursday before Easter will be observed this year throughout the Catholic world with peculiar solemnity. The reason of this is, that on this year that day falls on the 25th of March, which is also the anniversary of the Annunciation. Another edict has also been issued in Rome, namely, that from the 7th to the 14th of March all cafés, trattorias, and public places, shall be shut from two P.M. till sunset, in order that the faithful may have time afforded to them for attending sermons, catechising, and other religious services. There is only one class of offices which is privileged by being made an exception to this rule, and that is a class which for many years has been the bane of Italy, namely, the offices of public lotteries!

Although active preparations are going on for the meeting of the Ecumenical Council yet it is not at all certain that it will take place on the day originally appointed. The Pope himself expressed his doubts on this matter to a deputation of a society that had been formed for conveying water to Rome, and who waited on his holiness to thank him for allowing it to take the name of *La Società dell'Acqua Pia*. Pius IX. is reported to have said, on that occasion, that the present aspect of the times is of such a character that it is very doubtful whether the peace of Europe will be so preserved as to permit the meeting to take place in the month of December. Roman correspondents mention other reasons which are likely to postpone this council. A great number of bishops have given various reasons which they say prevent them from attending, and those who are opposed to the holding of this council maintain that its importance will depend on the number of members who are present. Even among the College of Cardinals the Council has many opponents, who think that the time has not yet come when Europe would receive its decisions ; and should these be slighted, the dignity of the Church would be impaired. There is another reason why such a council is not at all popular with many of the cardinals. The idea originated with the Jesuits, who now rule, manage, and dispose of all things. Were this council really to meet, it would form their greatest triumph, and put the cope-stone to their power. Many of the higher clergy, who have become jealous of the power of the Jesuits, are therefore throwing every obstacle in the way, so as to prevent this gathering from taking place. There is, besides, another difficulty which is now presenting itself to those who are anxious for the council. A considerable number of the French and German bishops have become wearied of their subjection to the power of Rome,

and are desirous of emancipation and the formation of National Churches. If the Court of Rome see any probability of such a question being brought before the council, it will not be at all anxious to hasten forward its meeting.

#### SPAIN.—THE EPISCOPATE AND RELIGIOUS LIBERTY.

—As a sign of the times, I may mention that a very interesting correspondence has been published between the Bishop of Pamplona and a professor in the College in that city. "The Bishop has heard with great pain that the professor is teaching doctrines not in accordance with those of the Church ;" and, with many amiable expressions, "hopes that such a course will not be continued." To this the professor replies in a very few lines—"that matters are now changed—there is freedom of education—that he cannot allow any interference in his classes, and recognises only one authority in the matter of what he teaches—his own conscience." Please to remember that it is a Spanish professor who thus addresses a Spanish bishop, and that five months ago the Roman Catholic Church reigned omnipotent in Spain!

SEVILLE.—The same correspondent writes :—

"This morning Mr. Cabrera preached to an audience which filled every available spot in the church, hundreds being unable to obtain admission, those who had seats having taken possession of them at ten o'clock and waited till twelve, when the services began. Shortly after six this evening, Mr. Cabrera, Mrs. Clough and myself, were at the church door, and we found the sexton addressing the multitude outside from the steps, entreating them to go home peaceably, because of the building being already crammed. Mr. Cabrera had with considerable difficulty a passage opened for him. The municipality have kindly sent three policemen to stand at the door outside to arrest any reactionist disposed to create a disturbance. We feel thankful for this, because of the late atrocious crime perpetrated in the Cathedral at Burgos.

Now, if in the course of twelve months the Lord had been pleased to so far bless our labours as to incline the hearts of multitudes to attend the house of God, and further accommodation were required, would not Christians at home come forward to assist us? Well, the Lord in his mercy has been pleased in three months to reveal himself with might and power in this city, in turning the hearts of men from the idolatries of Rome to embrace the one living and true way, even Jesus Christ our Saviour. I cannot make any greater appeal than by giving the above plain facts. Were it possible to translate Mr. Spurgeon's Tabernacle bodily to Seville to-day, it would be as well filled as it has ever been."

ADDRESS.—At a picnic given by the Bible class of the Sabbath scholars of Ormstown, a very affectionate address, signed by twenty-nine members of the Bible class and all the Sabbath scholars, was presented to their Superintendent, the Rev. James T. Paul. The address was received too late for insertion in its proper place.