


LIBRARY OF PRINCETON

MAR 27 1900

THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY



ac 232

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES

OF THE

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

OF

The Free Church of Scotland.


HELD AT EDINBURGH, MAY 1867.

EDINBURGH:

JAMES NICHOL, 104 HIGH STREET

LONDON: JAMES NISBET AND CO

M.DCCC.LXVII.



EDINBURGH:
PRINTED BY BALLANTYNE AND COMPANY,
PAUL'S WORK.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE		PAGE
List of Reports,	vi.	Overture anent Chair of Evange-	
Roll of Members and State of	vii.-xx.	listic Theology,	46
Votes,		Appointment of Dr Duff to the	
THURSDAY, MAY 23.		Chair,	47
Assembly Constituted,	1	Speech of Dr Candlish,	47
Election of Moderator,	1	Dr Blaikie,	49
Speech of Mr Wilson,	1	Professor Douglas,	50
Moderator's Address,	2	Dr Duff,	51
Address to the Queen,	10	Pastoral Address to Ministers, &c.,	
FRIDAY, MAY 24.		at Mission Stations,	57
Assembly Sermons,	10	Speech of Dr Duff,	57
Irish Presbyterian Assembly,	10	Report of Finance Committee,	58
Report on Collections,	11	Deputies from America,	58
Religion and Morals,	12	Speech of Dr Hickok,	59
Speech of Dr J. J. Wood,	12	Mr Parke,	62
Mr James Balfour,	15	Mr MacCracken,	64
Mr M'Corkle,	15	Dr Adams,	66
Letter from Dr Clason,	16	Dr Field,	69
Committee on Commissions—Re-		Mr Thome,	74
ference from the Presbytery of		Dr Candlish,	76
Aberdeen,	16	The Moderator,	78
Speech of Sir H. W. Moncreiff,	16	TUESDAY, MAY 28.	
Report on Conversion of the Jews,	17	Case of the Rev. Walter C. Smith,	80
Speech of Mr Moodie Stuart,	17	Speech of Mr Walker,	81
Dr Cappadose,	20	Sir H. W. Moncreiff,	83
Mr Adam,	28	Mr Nixon,	84
Professor Duncan,	29	Professor Douglas,	86
Dr Candlish,	32	Dr Forbes,	100
SATURDAY, MAY 25.		Dr Gibson,	120
Report on Widows' and Orphans' Fund,	33	Dr Buchanan,	135
Case of Kilmuir,	33	Professor Rainy,	146
Case of Innellan,	34	Mr Macgregor,	159
Case of Tobermory,	39	Dr Begg,	164
Case of Hillhead,	39	Dr M'Gilvray,	167
Case of Marshall Church, Kirkin-		Mr Nixon,	169
tilloch,	41	Sir H. W. Moncreiff,	169
MONDAY, MAY 27.		Principal Lumsden,	171
Address to her Majesty,	41	Dr Candlish,	171
Report on Mission Publications,	42	Dr Wood,	173
Report on Distribution of Probation-		Dr Rainy,	174
ers,	44	WEDNESDAY, MAY 29.	
Speech of Mr Mackenzie,	44	Deputation of Irish Presbyterian	
Returns to Overtures,	46	Church,	174
		Speech of Mr Wallace,	175
		Mr Gibson,	176

	PAGE		PAGE
Speech of Mr M'Corkle, . . .	176	Speech of Mr R. Johnston, . . .	356
The Moderator, . . .	177	Dr M'Lauchlan, . . .	358
Sustentation Fund—Special Re-		Mr R. C. Smith, . . .	360
ports, . . .	178	Principal Candlish, . . .	360
Speech of Dr Buchanan, . . .	178	Dr Forbes, . . .	368
Mr Ferguson, . . .	195	Principal Lumsden, . . .	369
Mr Charles Cowan, . . .	197	Dr Rainy, . . .	370
Mr Miller, . . .	197	Dr Begg, . . .	378
Mr Peter Denny, . . .	198	Resignation of Members of Union	
Mr Tulloch, . . .	199	Committee, . . .	378
Dr M'Lauchlan, . . .	200	Foreign Missions, . . .	379
Mr Rose, . . .	200	Speech of Dr Duff, . . .	379
Mr Bain, . . .	201	Dr Murray Mitchell, . . .	399
Mr Wilson, . . .	202	Professor Douglas, . . .	399
Charges contributing under £50, . . .	203	Mr William Kidston, . . .	400
Speech of Mr Wilson, . . .	203		
Dr Longmuir, . . .	203	SATURDAY, JUNE 1.	
Special Reports anent Schedules		English Presbyterian Church, . . .	402
and Supplements, . . .	203	Speech of Mr J. C. Paterson, . . .	402
Speech of Mr Wilson, . . .	203	Mr M'Caw, . . .	405
Report of Education Committee, . . .	204	Mr Wright, . . .	406
Speech of Mr Nixon, . . .	204	Mr Thos. Matheson, . . .	408
Mr Miller, . . .	208	Mr Duncan, . . .	409
The Royal Commissioners' Report		Mr Maclagan, . . .	411
on National Education, . . .	208	Mr Swanson, . . .	413
Speech of Mr Nixon, . . .	208	The Moderator, . . .	414
Sir H. W. Moncreiff, . . .	233	The Union Division, . . .	415
Mr Stark, . . .	237	Presbyterian Union in America—	
Mr Charles Cowan, . . .	238	Transatlantic Telegram, . . .	417
Mr Nixon, . . .	238	Church and Manse Building, . . .	417
Reference by Synod of Moray—		Speech of Mr Robt. Mackenzie, . . .	418
Complaint of Mr Moffat of Cairnie, . . .	239	Sabbath Observance, . . .	418
Speech of Mr Winter, . . .	240	Speech of Mr Alex. Mackenzie, . . .	418
Professor Rainy, . . .	240	Report on Temperance, . . .	419
Pastoral Address, . . .	243	Speech of Mr William Kidston, . . .	419
		Mr Bremner, . . .	422
THURSDAY, MAY 30.		Appointment of Committees, . . .	422
The Union Question, . . .	244	Speech of Mr Kelman, . . .	422
Speech of Dr Buchanan, . . .	244	The Church Manual, . . .	427
Dr Rainy, . . .	259	Forns of Process, . . .	427
Dr Begg, . . .	273	Gaelic Scriptures, . . .	428
Mr Denny, . . .	288	Speech of Rev. Mr Campbell, . . .	428
Dr Wood, . . .	289	Diffusion of Knowledge of Presby-	
Mr John Harvey, . . .	298	terian Principles, . . .	428
Mr Adam, . . .	304	Refusal of Sites, . . .	428
Mr M'Corkle, . . .	306	Speech of Mr Brown Douglas, . . .	428
Dr Grierson, . . .	309	Marriage Laws, . . .	430
Mr Burnside, . . .	311	College Committee, . . .	430
Mr Waters, . . .	312	Examination Board, . . .	430
Sir Henry Moncreiff, . . .	313		
Mr Nixon, . . .	321	MONDAY, JUNE 3.	
Mr H. B. Ferguson, . . .	324	Reply to the Assembly's Loyal Ad-	
Mr Fraser, . . .	326	dress, . . .	431
Mr Balfour, W.S., . . .	329	The Union Division again, . . .	431
		A Personal Explanation, . . .	432
FRIDAY, MAY 31.		Speech of Mr Charles Cowan, . . .	432
Speech of Dr Gibson, . . .	331	Case of Disputed Property at Eccle-	
Mr Stark, . . .	341	fechan, . . .	433
Colonel Davidson, . . .	343	Sales and Transferences of Pro-	
Mr Charles Cowan, . . .	345	perty, . . .	433
Mr Brown Douglas, . . .	345	Cases of Students, . . .	434
Mr Thorburn, . . .	348	Colleagues and Successors, . . .	435
Captain Shepherd, . . .	353	Speech of Dr J. J. Wood, . . .	435
Mr Walker, . . .	354		

	PAGE		PAGE
Case of Mr Fraser of Gordon, . . .	435	English Presbyterian Church, . . .	478
Home Mission Scheme, . . .	437		
Speech of Mr Wilson, . . .	437	TUESDAY, JUNE 4.	
Dr W. G. Blaikie, . . .	439	Sanctioning Charges, . . .	479
Applications for Colleagues and		Speech of Mr Adams, . . .	479
Successors, . . .	443	Act anent Collections, . . .	483
Assistants, . . .	445	Special Cases, . . .	483
Report on Psalmody, . . .	445	Endowment of Colleges, . . .	484
Speech of Mr Livingston, . . .	445	Library of Reference, . . .	484
Dr David Brown, . . .	445	Popery, . . .	485
Dr Douglas, . . .	449	Houses for the Working Classes, . . .	485
Paraphrases and Hymns, . . .	450	Predisruption Ministers' Fund, . . .	485
Speech of Dr Buchanan, . . .	450	Platform of the Equal Dividend, . . .	485
Rights of Colleagues and Successors, . . .	450	John Knox's House, . . .	486
Report of Commissioners on Na-		Moderating of Calls, . . .	486
tional Education, . . .	451	Colonial Committee, . . .	486
Speech of Sir H. W. Moncreiff, . . .	451	Pastoral Addresses, . . .	486
The Highlands and Islands, . . .	451	Records of Disruption Ministers, . . .	487
Speech of Dr M'Lauchlan, . . .	451	Distribution of Probationers, . . .	487
Dr Rainy, . . .	456	Inadequate Supply of Probationers, . . .	488
Mr Cameron, . . .	459	Reappointment of Committees, . . .	489
Rev. K. M'Donald, . . .	461	Conference with Presbyteries, . . .	489
Colonial and Continental Missions, . . .	462	Charges under £50, . . .	489
Speech of Principal Lumsden, . . .	462	The Union Division, . . .	490
Mr Hermann Waas, . . .	464	Correspondence with American	
Dr Turnbull, . . .	467	Churches, . . .	492
Dr Van Ness, . . .	469	Sabbath Schools, . . .	493
Rev. Jas. Cameron, . . .	469	Speech of Mr Dickson, . . .	493
Rev. P. Barclay, . . .	470	Mr Brown Douglas, . . .	496
Rev. A. N. Somerville, . . .	470	Dr Rainy, . . .	497
The Moderator, . . .	474	Pastoral Address to Missionaries, . . .	498
Ordinances on the Continent, . . .	475	Speech of Dr Duff, . . .	498
Deputations to Visit Presbyteries, . . .	475	Address on Prevailing Errors, . . .	500
Speech of Mr Winter, . . .	475	The Late Mr Paul and Mr H. Dun-	
Mr Stark, . . .	475	lop, . . .	500
Dr Buchanan, . . .	477	Appointment of Next General As-	
The General Trustees, . . .	478	sembly, . . .	501
Assembly Arrangements, . . .	478	Appointment of Commission, . . .	501
		Moderator's Closing Address, . . .	501

REPORTS

- I. Sustentation Fund — Financial Report.
- II. The Education Scheme.
- III. Home Mission and Church Extension — Financial Report.
- IV. The Highlands and Islands.
- V. College.
- VI. Colonial and Continental.
- VII. Foreign Missions.
- VIII. Conversion of the Jews.
- IX. Church and Manse Building.
- X. Distribution of the Fund for Pre-Disruption Ministers.
- XI. Assembly Arrangements.
- XII. Finance.
- XIII. Publications.
- XIV. Condition of Ecclesiastical Buildings.
- XV. Paraphrases and Hymns.
- XVI. Distribution of Probationers.
- XVII. Election of Professors.
- XVIII. Platform of the Equal Dividend.
- XIX. State of Religion and Morals.
- XX. Sabbath Observance.
- XXI. Temperance.
- XXII. Popery.
- XXIII. Diffusion of a Knowledge of Presbyterian Church - Government.
- XXIV. Inadequate Supply of Probationers.
- XXV. Houses for the Working Classes.
- XXVI. Establishment of a Library of Reference.
- XXVII. Charges contributing at and under £50 per annum to Sustentation Fund.
- XXVIII. Schedules Passing Committee during the last ten years for the Moderation of Calls.
- XXIX. Supplement to Ministers.
- XXX. Report of Committee on Sustentation Fund.
- XXXI. Ministers', Widows', and Orphans' Fund.
- XXXII. Union with other Churches.
- XXXIII. Case of Ecclefechan.
- XXXIV. Psalmody.
- XXXV. Aged and Infirm Ministers' Fund.
- XXXVI. Report of Committee on Committees.
- XXXVII. Supply of Ordinance for our Countrymen on the Continent.
- XXXVIII. Manual of Church Procedure.
- XXXIX. Assembly Hall Committee.
- XL. Refusal of Sites.
- XLI. States Reported by the General Trustees.
- XLII. Gaelic Scriptures.

ROLL OF MEMBERS

OF THE

GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE FREE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND, MAY 1867.

THREE DIVISIONS took place in the Assembly. The votes of the members are indicated by the figures added to their names corresponding to the numbers appended to the following list of motions. The Divisions were as follow :—

First Division—Rev. W. C. Smith's Case,.....	{ Dr Rainy's motion,.....1
	{ Dr Begg's motion,.....2
<i>Tellers</i> (for 1.)—Dr Rainy, Mr James M'Gregor, Dr Murray Mitchell, Mr Tasker.	
(for 2.)—Dr Begg, Mr M'Corkle, Dr M'Gillivray, Dr Wood.	
Second Division—On Union,.....	{ Dr Begg's motion,.....3
	{ Mr Nixon's motion,.....4
<i>Tellers</i> (for 3.)—Dr Begg, Mr Thorburn, Dr Forbes, Dr Gibson.	
(for 4.)—Mr Nixon, Mr R. C. Smith, Mr Robert Johnston, Dr Duncan.	
Third Division—On Union,.....	{ Dr Rainy's motion,.....5
	{ Mr Nixon's motion,.....6
<i>Tellers</i> (for 5.)—Dr Rainy, Dr R. Buchanan, Mr F. Brown Douglas, Col. Davidson.	
(for 6.)—Mr Nixon, Dr Duncan, Mr R. C. Smith, Mr Robert Johnston.	

1st 2d 3d
Div. Div. Div.

Synod of Fife.

Presbytery of Dunfermline.

Rev. William Gilston, Carnock,	2	-	6
„ James Mackenzie, Dunfermline,	1	-	5
„ Andrew Brydie, Dunfermline,	1	4	6
„ Mr George Meldrum, accountant, Edinburgh,	-	-	5
„ Robert Mackenzie, merchant, Dundee,	1	-	5
„ John Macgregor, preacher of the gospel,	1	4	5

Presbytery of Kinross.

Rev. William Macara, Strathmiglo,	2	3	6
„ James Cullen, Kelty,	2	3	6
„ Mr R. Simson, farmer, Blairnathort,	1	-	5
„ Wm. Johnston, Inland Revenue, Edinburgh,	1	4	6

Presbytery of Kirkcaldy.

Rev. John Spiers, Kinglassie,	1	-	-
„ John H. Ballingall, Kinghorn,	2	4	6
„ N. L. Walker, Dysart,	1	-	5
„ John Logan, Leslie,	2	4	6
„ Peter Macainsh, Lochgelly,	1	3	5
„ Mr James Alexander, surgeon, Leslie,	-	-	-
„ John Stocks, Inverteil Bank, Kirkcaldy,	2	4	5
„ Thomas Kay, manufacturer, Pathhead, Kirkcaldy,	2	-	-
„ Robert Davidson of Bogie,	1	-	-
„ Patrick Don Swan, Provost of Kirkcaldy,	1	-	5

	1st Div.	2d Div.	3d Div.
<i>Presbytery of Cupar.</i>			
Rev. Thomas Burnside, Falkland,	2	3	6
„ G. R. Sommerville, Logie and Gauldry,	1	-	5
„ Alexander Maxwell, Kettle and Cults,	1	-	5
„ David Imrie, Ceres,	-	4	6
„ Mr John Honeyman, manufacturer, Cupar, Fife,	-	-	-
„ William Brown, farmer, Ramornie,	1	-	-
„ Alexander Storrar, farmer, Craigfoodie,	-	-	-
„ William Strachan, contractor, Craigrothie,	-	-	-
<i>Presbytery of St Andrews.</i>			
Rev. Andrew Keay, Crail,	1	3	5
„ Walter Wood, Elie,	1	3	5
„ William P. Falconer, Ferry-Port-on-Craig,	1	-	5
„ Mr William Duncan, farmer, Pittowie,	1	3	5
„ J. Chalmers, teacher, Ferry-Port-on-Craig,	1	-	5
„ William R. Ketchen, banker, Elie,	1	-	5
<i>Synod of Angus and Mearns.</i>			
<i>Presbytery of Meigle.</i>			
Rev. Archibald Ferguson, Alyth,	2	4	6
„ James Simpson, Glenisla,	-	-	-
„ John Fleming, Newtyle,	1	-	5
„ Mr William Yeaman, banker, Alyth,	1	-	-
„ John Finlay, merchant, Alyth,	1	4	6
„ Charles Playfair, Banchory,	-	-	5
<i>Presbytery of Forfar.</i>			
Rev. John D. Fisher, Aberlemno,	1	-	-
„ Simeon R. Macphail, Forfar, East,	1	-	-
„ Thomas J. Patteson, Kinnettles,	-	4	5
„ Mr P. H. Thoms of Aberlemno,	1	-	-
„ David Crichton, banker, Forfar,	1	3	6
„ William Barry, merchant, Forfar,	1	-	5
<i>Presbytery of Dundee.</i>			
Rev. William Wilson, Dundee,	-	-	5
„ James Ewing, Dundee,	1	-	5
„ John Hunter, Longforgan,	1	-	5
„ John M'Pherson, Dundee,	1	-	5
„ Neil Taylor, Dundee,	2	4	6
„ Dr John Murray Mitchell, Broughty Ferry,	1	-	5
„ John Duke, Dundee,	1	-	5
„ H. W. Bell, Dundee,	1	-	5
„ Mr William Robertson, engineer, Dundee,	2	-	5
„ H. B. Fergusson, merchant, Dundee,	1	-	5
„ William Small, teacher, Dundee,	1	4	6
„ James Macdonald, merchant, Dundee,	1	-	-
„ James Cunningham, merchant, Dundee,	1	-	5
„ Thomas Thornton, solicitor, Dundee,	1	-	-
„ James S. Rogers, merchant, Rosemill,	1	-	5
„ Alexander Stuart, grocer, Dundee,	-	-	-
<i>Presbytery of Brechin.</i>			
Rev. Wm. Nixon, St John's, Montrose,	-	4	6
„ A. L. R. Footc, Brechin,	1	-	5
„ G. S. Sutherland, St Paul's, Montrose,	1	4	-
„ A. Cameron, Marytown,	1	-	5
„ Mr Francis Japp, upholsterer, Montrose,	1	-	-
„ John Mackenzie, corn merchant, Montrose,	1	4	5
„ Robert Salmond, farmer, West Main, Rossie,	1	-	5
„ A. Thomson, F. C. Education Office, Edinburgh,	-	4	-

1st 2d 3d
Div. Div. Div.

Presbytery of Arbroath.

Rev. John Sandison, High Street, Arbroath,	1	-	5
„ Thomas Wilson, Friockheim,	1	4	5
„ David Crichton, Inverbrothock,	1	4	6
„ Alexander Leslie, Ladyloan,	1	4	5
„ Mr James Swan, farmer, Arbirlot,	1	-	5
„ John Adam, lately teacher, Arbroath,	2	4	6
„ William Salmond, merchant, Arbroath,	1	-	-
„ William J. Anderson, banker, Arbroath,	1	-	5

Presbytery of Fordoun.

Rev. David Simpson, Laurencekirk,	1	4	5
„ James G. Gray, minister at Marykirk,	1	-	5
„ George Anderson, St Cyrus,	1	-	5
„ James Cameron, Glenberrie,	1	-	5
„ Mr William S. Thom, Albert Street, Aberdeen,	-	-	5
„ David Burness, Laurencekirk,	1	-	5
„ Francis Edmond, advocate, Aberdeen,	1	-	5
„ Wm. R. Watson, 63 Cumberland Street, Edinburgh,	1	-	5

Synod of Aberdeen.

Presbytery of Aberdeen.

Rev. Dr D. Brown, Professor of Divinity, Aberdeen,	1	-	5
„ William Lamb Mitchell, Holborn, Aberdeen,	1	-	-
„ Dr John Longmuir, Mariners', Aberdeen,	2	-	5
„ John Adam, South, Aberdeen,	1	-	5
„ A. M'Kinlay Bannatyne, Union, Aberdeen,	2	4	6
„ Thomas Gardiner, Old Machar,	-	3	6
„ James M. Mackintosh, Skene,	1	-	5
„ Charles Ross, Bon-Accord, Aberdeen,	2	-	5
Principal Lumsden, of the F. C. College, Aberdeen,	-	-	5
Rev. Dr Walter M'Gilvray, Gilcomston, Aberdeen,	2	4	6
„ Mr George Gray, merchant in Aberdeen,	-	-	-
„ „ William Hutton, merchant, Woodside,	1	-	-
„ „ James Fraser of Heathcote,	2	-	5
„ „ Alexander Thomson of Banchory,	-	-	-
„ Dr R. J. Brown, late Professor in Marischal College,	1	-	5
„ Mr George Rose, merchant in Aberdeen,	-	-	5
„ „ D. R. L. Grant of Kingsford,	-	-	5
„ „ James Buyers, shipowner in Aberdeen,	2	3	6
„ „ David Macdonald, merchant in Aberdeen,	1	3	6
„ „ Wm. Henderson, one of the bailies of Aberdeen,	-	-	5

Presbytery of Kincardine O'Neil.

Rev. Thomas Murray, Midmar,	1	-	5
„ Robert Stewart, Tarland,	2	-	-
„ William Robertson, Aboyne,	2	4	6
„ Thomas Stothert, Lumphanan,	1	-	5
„ Mr W. Dickson, wholesale stationer, Edinburgh,	1	-	5
„ Dr George G. Brown, Aberdeen,	1	-	5
„ Mr Hugh Cowan, Sheriff-Substitute, Paisley,	1	4	5
„ „ George Grant, advocate, Aberdeen,	-	-	5

Presbytery of Alford.

Rev. A. Fullarton, Strathdon and Glenbucket,	1	-	5
„ John Coutts, Kennethmont,	-	-	5
„ Mr James Blackadder, 34 Abercromby Place, Edinburgh,	-	-	-
„ Major John Ross of Tillycorthy,	1	-	5

	1st Div.	2d Div.	3d Div.
<i>Presbytery of Garioch.</i>			
Rev. David Simson, Oyne,	2	-	-
„ Robert M'Combie, Leslie and Premnay,	-	-	5
„ George Bain, Chapel of Garioch,	2	-	5
„ James B. Sturrock, Kemnay,	1	-	5
Captain Shepherd of Kirkville,	-	3	6
Mr Alexander Kemp, farmer, Kintore,	1	-	5
„ Robert Spence, farmer, Chapel of Garioch,	1	-	-
„ John Dean, farmer, Balquhain,	-	-	-
<i>Presbytery of Ellon.</i>			
Rev. James E. Dnguid, New Machar,	1	-	5
„ Alexander Cumming, Old Meldrum,	1	-	5
„ George Archibald, Udney,	1	-	5
Mr Wm. Henderson, Devanha House, Aberdeen,	1	-	5
„ Alexander Grant, farmer at Stones, Cruden,	2	3	-
„ J. Barron, farmer at Middle Ardo, Belhelvie,	-	-	5
<i>Presbytery of Deer.</i>			
Rev. James Yuill, Peterhead,	1	4	5
„ James Murdoch, Pitsligo,	1	-	5
„ Robert Taylor, New Pitsligo,	1	-	5
„ William Paterson, Fraserburgh,	1	4	5
Mr John Davidson, Mill of Clola,	2	-	-
„ William Garden, Braeco Park, Roseheart,	1	4	6
„ William Cruickshank, farmer, Fraserburgh,	1	-	5
„ William Cowan, Montpelier, Edinburgh,	-	-	5
<i>Presbytery of Turriff.</i>			
Rev. John Rae, Gamrie,	1	-	5
„ James Simpson, Monquhitter,	1	-	5
„ Alexander Forbes, Drumblade,	1	-	5
Mr Neil Smith, jun., merchant, Aberdeen,	-	-	5
„ William Mitchell, post master, Aberdeen,	-	4	6
„ Duncan Wilkie Paterson, S.S.C., Edinburgh,	1	3	6
<i>Presbytery of Fordyce.</i>			
Rev. Charles W. Barelay, Enzie,	-	4	6
„ Alexander Spencer, Ordiqhill and Ord,	-	4	6
„ John Mackay, Cullen,	-	4	5
Dr Joshua Paterson, Glasgow,	-	-	5
„ A. Halliday Douglas, Edinburgh,	1	-	5
Major-General Charles Wahab, Edinburgh,	1	-	5
Synod of Moray.			
<i>Presbytery of Strathbogie.</i>			
Rev. William Raitt, Gartly,	1	-	-
„ David Henry, Marnoch,	1	-	5
„ William Moffat, Cairnie,	2	3	6
Mr John Geddes, mining engineer, Edinburgh,	1	-	-
„ Alexander M'Nab, Lillyburn, Campsie,	1	-	5
„ William Allan, merchant, Marnoch,	1	-	5
<i>Presbytery of Abernethy.</i>			
Rev. Evan Gordon, Grantown,	-	-	-
„ Neil Dewar, Kingussie,	-	4	5
Mr Neil C. Campbell, Sheriff of Ayr,	1	-	5
„ Donald Beith, W.S., Edinburgh,	1	-	5
<i>Presbytery of Aberlour.</i>			
Rev. Patrick Tulloch, Inveravon,	2	4	6
„ John Shoolbraid, Mortlach,	2	-	5
Mr Adam Sharp of Clyth, Rothes,	1	-	5
„ Alexander Paterson, farmer, Mulben, Boharm,	1	-	-

	1st Div.	2d Div.	3d Div.
<i>Presbytery of Elgin.</i>			
Rev. David Waters, Burghhead,	2	-	6
„ James Morrison, Urquhart,	1	4	6
„ Archibald Smellie, High Church, Elgin,	1	4	6
„ Mr Robert John Rose, residenter at Elgin,	1	-	5
„ George Hay, residenter at Elgin,	1	4	5
„ William Anderson, farmer in Urquhart,	-	-	-
<i>Presbytery of Forres.</i>			
Rev. Adam Robertson, Forres,	-	-	-
„ William Winter, Dyke,	2	3	6
„ Mr Henry Tod, W.S. at Edinburgh,	1	-	5
„ William Stalker, draper, Forres,	1	-	-
<i>Presbytery of Inverness.</i>			
Rev. Adam Campbell, Petty,	2	-	5
„ Angus Brown, Inverness,	1	-	6
„ George Mackay, Inverness,	2	4	6
„ Donald Fraser, Inverness,	1	-	6
„ Mr Arthur Fraser of Culrossie,	-	-	-
„ George France of Silverwell, Inverness,	-	-	-
„ John Mackenzie, clothier at Inverness,	-	-	-
„ A. Simpson, one of the magistrates of Inverness,	1	4	6
<i>Presbytery of Nairn.</i>			
Rev. Alexander Cameron, Ardersier,	2	3	6
„ Adam Gordon Macleod, Croy,	2	-	-
„ Mr James Gray, late ironmonger, Edinburgh,	1	-	5
„ W. Brown, Secretary of the Scottish National Insurance Company, Edinburgh,	-	-	6
Synod of Ross.			
<i>Presbytery of Chanonry.</i>			
Rev. Duncan S. M'Eachran, Cromarty,	1	-	5
„ John M'Kerchar, Avoch,	1	-	6
„ Mr Robert Romanes, 4 Oxford Terrace, Edinburgh,	1	-	5
„ David Murray, Cromarty,	2	-	-
<i>Presbytery of Dingwall.</i>			
Rev. W. S. M'Dougall, Fodderty and Contin,	2	-	-
„ D. R. Munro, Maryburgh,	1	-	5
„ Andrew D. Mackenzie, Kilmorack,	2	-	5
„ Mr Benjamin Bell, surgeon, Edinburgh,	1	-	5
„ D. Dickson, wholesale stationer, Edinburgh,	1	-	5
„ Aeneas Adam, Humberston, Dingwall,	-	-	-
<i>Presbytery of Tain.</i>			
Rev. John Macdonald, Fearn,	2	-	-
„ Donald Murray, Tarbat,	-	-	-
„ John H. Fraser, Rosskeen,	2	4	6
„ Murdoch Macdonald, Logie Easter,	2	4	6
„ Mr William Mackenzie, Ardross, Rosskeen,	2	4	6
„ Thomas Martin, accountant, Edinburgh,	2	-	5
„ Thomas Jamieson Boyd, publisher, Edinburgh,	-	4	5
„ A. Ellison Ross, S.S.C., Edinburgh,	1	4	5
Synod of Sutherland and Caithness.			
<i>Presbytery of Dornoch.</i>			
Rev. Alexander Murchison, Helmsdale,	2	-	5
„ Alexander Macleod, Rogart,	-	-	-
„ Charles Gordon, Assynt,	-	-	-
„ Mr Patrick Tennant, W.S., Edinburgh,	-	-	5
„ Dr J. A. Wylie, Professor Protestant Institute,	2	-	5
„ Mr John Harvey, Park Terrace, Stirling,	1	-	5

	1st Div.	2d Div.	3d Div.
<i>Presbytery of Tongue.</i>			
Rev. David Mackenzie, Farr,	-	3	-
„ Donald Corbet, Kinlochbervie,	2	4	6
„ James Ross, Durness,	2	-	5
Captain James Ogilvie Dalgleish of Woodburne,	1	-	5
Dr William Stevenson, Crieff,	2	4	6
Mr Wm. D. Young, Gilmore Place, Edinburgh,	2	-	5
<i>Presbytery of Cuthness.</i>			
Rev. Walter Ross Taylor, Thurso,	2	-	5
„ Alexander Gunn, Watten,	-	-	-
„ Samuel Campbell, Berriedale,	-	-	-
„ George Stevenson, Pultneytown,	2	4	5
„ John Mackay, Lybster,	-	4	6
„ John Durran, Bower,	-	-	-
Mr Robert Johnston, W.S., Edinburgh,	1	4	6
„ James Loutit, Provost of Wick,	-	-	-
„ George Leith, merchant, Pultneytown,	2	4	-
„ James Iverach, farmer, Halkirk,	1	-	-
„ William Bremner, chemist, Thurso,	2	-	5
„ Donald Mackay, farmer, Thurso,	2	4	-
<i>Synod of Glenelg.</i>			
<i>Presbytery of Lochcarron.</i>			
Rev. Duncan Matheson, Gairloch,	-	-	-
„ William Rose, Poolewe,	2	3	6
„ Kenneth Macdonald, Applecross,	-	-	5
Mr Alexander C. S. Murray Dunlop, M.P.	-	-	5
„ J. Macdonald, General Treasurer of the Church,	-	-	5
„ Francis Brown Douglas, advocate,	1	-	5
<i>Presbytery of Abertarff.</i>			
Rev. Charles Stewart, Fort-William,	-	-	-
„ Angus M'Rae, Glenurquhart,	2	-	-
Mr Peter Drummond, seedsman, Stirling,	2	-	6
„ Thomas M'Kenzie, farmer, Dores,	-	-	-
<i>Presbytery of Skye and Uist.</i>			
Rev. Dr M'Intosh Mackay, Tarbert,	2	3	6
„ Alexander M'Coll, Duirinish,	2	3	6
„ John Fletcher, Braacadale,	2	3	6
„ Alexander Davidson, Manish,	-	-	-
Mr Kenneth Macqueen, Edinburgh,	-	-	-
„ William Wood, 2 Oxford Terrace, Edinburgh,	1	-	5
„ H. Handyside, Free Church Offices,	-	-	-
„ John Cameron, Portree, Isle of Skye,	2	3	6
<i>Presbytery of Lewis.</i>			
Rev. John Campbell, Uig,	-	-	-
„ Allan M'Arthur, Barvas,	2	4	6
„ George L. Campbell, Lochs,	-	-	-
Mr Thomas Cleghorn, Sheriff of Argyle,	-	-	5
„ Duncan Grant, publisher, Edinburgh,	2	4	6
„ Hugh Buie, Greenock,	2	-	-
<i>Presbytery of Orkney.</i>			
<i>(Having Synodical powers.)</i>			
Rev. James Roy, Firth and Stennes,	1	-	5
„ Robert Wilson, North Ronaldshay,	1	-	5
„ Adam White, Harray and Sandwick,	2	4	6
„ Adam Rettie, Ervie and Rendall,	2	3	6
Dr Robert Omond, physician, Edinburgh,	-	-	5
Mr Charles Cowan of Logan House,	-	4	5
Rev. John F. Brown, Southern Academy, Edinburgh,	-	-	-
Mr John Macmillan, Emeritus Master and Examiner of the High School, Edinburgh,	-	3	6

1st Div.	2d Div.	3d Div.
----------	---------	---------

Presbytery of Shetland.

(Having Synodical powers.)

Rev. James Doull, Fetlar,	-	-	6
„ Alexander Macdonald, Weisdale,	-	-	5
„ Alexander Martin, Dunrossness,	1	-	5
„ Mr Thomas Clark, jun., publisher, Edinburgh,	1	-	5
„ James Balfour, W.S., Edinburgh,	1	-	5
„ George Martin, Glasgow,	-	-	5

Synod of Lothian and Tweeddale.

Presbytery of Edinburgh.

Rev. Dr John Duncan, Professor, New College,	1	4	6
„ Dr James Bannerman, Professor, do.,	-	-	-
„ Dr William G. Blaikie, Pirig,	1	-	5
„ Harry Anderson, Colinton and Currie,	-	-	6
„ James Smith, Cramond,	1	-	-
„ William Tasker, West Port,	1	-	-
„ Thomas Brown, Chalmers', Dean,	1	-	5
„ Dr Thomas M'Lauchlan, St Columba's,	-	-	5
„ Dr Robert Smith Candlish, St George's,	1	-	5
„ David K. Guthrie, Liberton,	1	-	5
„ James Gall, Moray,	1	-	5
„ E. A. Thomson, St Stephen's,	1	-	5
„ Robert Macdonald, North Leith,	1	-	5
„ William Balfour, Holyrood,	2	3	6
„ David Thorburn, South Leith,	-	3	6
„ Dr Patrick Clason, Buccleuch,	-	-	-
„ James Lewis, St John's, Leith,	1	-	5
„ William Nisbet, Canongate,	1	3	6
„ Thomas Main, St Mary's,	-	3	6
„ Dr James Begg, Newington,	2	3	6
„ Sir H. W. Moncrieff, Bart., D.D., St Cuthbert's,	1	-	5
„ Dr Robert Rainy, Professor, New College,	1	-	5
„ Mr Neilson Fyfe, cork manufacturer,	-	-	5
„ James Jeffrey, 4 Upper Gilmore Place,	1	-	5
„ George Greig, Inspector of Poor,	1	-	5
„ William Warrick, merchant, Leith,	2	-	5
„ William Cooper of the High School,	-	3	6
„ James Moffat, Clarence Place,	-	-	5
„ John Gardener, S.S.C., Trinity,	1	-	-
„ Hector Munro, gardener, West Coates,	1	-	5
„ Farquhar Kennedy, 40 Cumberland Street,	-	-	5
Rev. George Wilson, 38 Dublin Street,	1	-	5
Mr G. E. Russell, one of the magistrates of Edinburgh,	2	3	6
Rev. James Grant Mackintosh, 28 Walker Street,	1	-	5
Colonel George Anderson of Edgehill,	2	-	5
Dr Alexander Duff,	-	-	-
Mr William Brown, F.R.C.S.E.,	1	-	5
Dr J. Young Myrtle,	2	3	6
Colonel Young,	-	-	5
Mr George Dalziel, W.S., Edinburgh,	-	-	5
„ Pillans Scarth, W.S., Leith,	-	-	-
„ Thomas Duff, merchant, Leith,	2	-	-
Colonel Davidson,	1	-	5
Mr J. M. M'Candlish, manager of the Scottish National Insurance Company,	1	-	-

Presbytery of Linlithgow.

Rev. J. C. Burns, Kirkliston,	1	-	5
„ Archibald Currie, Abercorn,	2	-	-
„ Alexander Luke, Uphall,	1	-	5
„ C. L. C. Tulloch, Livingston,	1	4	6
„ James Kessen, Bathgate,	1	-	5

	1st Div.	2d Div.	3d Div.
Mr A. W. Niven, gardener at Hopetoun House,	1	-	5
„ John Thomson, Laurieston, Falkirk,	1	-	5
„ John Emslie, joiner, Broxburn,	-	-	-
„ William Wyllie, farmer, Easter Bangour,	-	-	-
„ David Simpson, banker, Bathgate,	1	-	5
<i>Presbytery of Biggar and Peebles.</i>			
Rev. James Proudfoot, Culter,	-	-	5
„ Andrew Forrest, Innerleithen	1	-	5
Mr John Miller of Leithen,	2	-	5
„ J. Waugh, of St John's Kirk, Symington,	-	-	5
<i>Presbytery of Dalkeith.</i>			
Rev. William W. Aitken, Carlops,	1	4	6
„ Alexander Cant Kay, Loanhead,	2	4	5
„ John Morrison Sloan, M.A., Dalkeith,	1	-	5
„ John Gray, M.A., Stobhill,	1	4	5
„ John Russell, B.A., Pathhead and Ormiston,	1	4	6
Mr William Sutherland, teacher, Penicuik,	1	-	5
„ James Kemp, merchant, Musselburgh,	-	-	-
„ Hew Francis Cadell of Cockenzie,	1	-	-
„ John S. Gibb, rector, Academy, Dalkeith,	-	-	5
„ Thomas Chalmers of Longcroft, Linlithgow,	1	-	5
<i>Presbytery of Haddington and Dunbar.</i>			
Rev. Samuel Robertson, Pencaitland,	1	-	5
„ Andrew Wallace, Cockburnspath,	1	-	5
„ John Hamilton Howson, Dirleton,	1	4	6
„ Arthur Thomson, Salton,	-	-	-
„ James Stuart, Yester,	1	-	5
Mr Robert Wilson, farmer, Herdmanston Mains,	-	-	-
„ James Hood, farmer, New Mains,	1	-	5
„ John MacLennan, farmer, Fountainhall,	-	-	5
„ Charles Scott, farmer, Palmerton,	1	-	5
„ Patrick Dalmahoy, W.S., Edinburgh,	-	-	5
<i>Synod of Merse and Teviotdale.</i>			
<i>Presbytery of Dunse and Chirnside.</i>			
Rev. James Ketchan, Mordington,	-	-	5
„ Adam Spence, Houndwood,	1	-	5
„ Alexander Rodger, Coldstream,	-	-	5
Mr John Wilson, farmer, Eddington Mains,	-	-	-
„ Thomas Davidson, farmer, West Mains,	-	-	-
„ John Purves, clothier, Swinton,	-	-	-
<i>Presbytery of Kelso and Lauder.</i>			
Rev. David Dobbie, Makerstoun,	-	-	5
„ Peter C. Purves, Morebattle,	1	-	5
„ Robert Maclaren Webster, Sprouston,	1	-	5
Mr Robert Fox, joiner, Morebattle,	-	-	5
„ William Turnbull, farmer, Graden,	-	-	-
„ John Yule, Mellowlees,	-	-	5
<i>Presbytery of Jedburgh.</i>			
Rev. John Purves, Jedburgh,	-	-	-
„ T. S. Anderson, Crailing,	1	4	5
„ James M'Clymont, Denholm,	1	-	5
Mr A. Easton, one of the magistrates of Jedburgh,	1	-	5
„ Adam Arres, farmer, Ormiston,	-	-	-
„ James C. Mudie, High School, Hawick,	1	3	5

1st 2d 3d
Div. Div. Div.

Presbytery of Selkirk.

Rev. James Young, Selkirk,	1	-	5
„ James Selkirk, Galashiels,	-	-	5
„ Alexander Giles, Ashkirk,	1	-	5
„ Mr William M'Bean, bookseller, Melrose,	2	3	6
„ Thomas Ovens, merchant, Galashiels,	2	-	-
„ William Brown, manufacturer, Galashiels,	1	-	-

Synod of Dumfries.

Presbytery of Lockerby.

Rev. Alexander D. Campbell, Lockerby,	2	4	6
„ Andrew Inglis, Ecclefechan,	-	4	5
„ John Davidson, Langholm,	1	4	-
„ Robert Kinnear, Moffat,	1	4	6
„ Mr Thomas Stewart, Gillenbie, Lockerby,	2	-	5
„ Robert Smellie, merchant, Langholm,	-	-	-
„ John Waugh, farmer, Castlehill,	-	-	5
„ R. Ewart, farmer, Caldronlee, Kirkpatrick-Fleming,	-	-	-

Presbytery of Dumfries.

Rev. Dr James Julius Wood, Dumfries,	2	3	6
„ Alexander Brown, Ruthwell,	1	3	6
„ Robert Wright, Dalbeattie,	1	-	5
„ Gilbert Laurie, Dumfries,	1	4	6
„ Mr M. Gray, grocer, Dumfries,	2	3	6
„ T. Wilson, farmer, Summerhill,	-	-	-
„ G. Edgar, farmer, Clonfeckle,	-	-	-
„ Alexander Reid, of Newton Reid,	1	-	5

Presbytery of Penpont.

Rev. Thomas Hastings, Wanlockhead,	2	4	5
„ Patrick Borrowman, Glencairn,	2	3	6
„ Mr W. Lorimer, farmer, in Rigg of Kirkconnel,	-	-	-
„ John Irving, farmer, Boreland, Glencairn,	1	3	6

Synod of Galloway.

Presbytery of Stranraer.

Rev. Peter Ferguson, Inch,	1	-	5
„ Alexander Warrack, Leswalt,	1	-	5
„ John Jamieson, Cairnryan,	1	-	5
„ Thomas Brown, Stoneykirk,	1	-	5
„ Mr A. H. Maclean, farmer, Leswalt,	1	-	5
„ James Spens, farmer, Stoneykirk,	1	-	5
„ George Edward, goldsmith, Glasgow,	1	-	5
„ Thomas M'Micking, merchant, Glasgow,	1	-	5

Presbytery of Wigtown.

Rev. James M. M'Culloch, Newton-Stewart,	1	-	-
„ James Gorrie, Sorbie,	2	-	5
„ Mr James Cochrane, farmer, Corwar,	-	3	6
„ F. L. Maitland Heriot, Sheriff of Forfarshire,	1	-	5

Presbytery of Kirkcudbright.

Rev. Patrick M'Neil, Auchencairn,	1	4	5
„ Dr John M'Millan, Kirkcudbright,	-	-	5
„ George Brown, Castle-Douglas,	-	-	-
„ Mr Peter Shaw, Kirkcudbright,	1	-	5
„ Samuel M'Kean, Castle-Douglas,	-	-	5
„ John Drybrough, Edinburgh,	-	-	5

1st	2d	3d
Div.	Div.	Div.

Synod of Glasgow and Ayr.

Presbytery of Ayr.

Rev. Neil Livingston, Stair,	-	4	5
„ Andrew H. Cowan, Troon,	1	-	5
„ Andrew Rowand, Wallacetown,	-	-	-
„ John M'Lennan, Crosshill,	1	-	-
„ Robert H. Arbuckle, Kirkoswald,	1	-	5
„ James Clark, Dalrymple,	1	-	5
„ Robert C. Lindsay, Tarbolton,	1	-	5
„ John Ferguson, Barr,	1	-	5
Mr Robert Williamson, Ainslie Place, Edinburgh,	2	-	5
„ David M'Lagan, accountant, Edinburgh,	1	-	5
„ Hugh Cowan, banker, Ayr,	1	3	6
„ Matthew Reid, clerk, Ayr,	1	-	-
„ Gilbert Graham, teacher, Edinburgh,	1	-	5
„ Nathan Wilson, farmer, Woodlands,	1	-	5
„ John Semple, farmer, Glenluie,	2	-	5
„ James Craig, miller, Tarbolton,	1	-	5

Presbytery of Irvine.

Rev. John Connell, Perceton,	1	-	5
„ Robert S. Macaulay, Irvine,	1	-	5
„ William Reid, Hurlford,	1	-	5
„ John M'Gowan, Catrine,	2	3	6
„ Alexander Steele, Dalry,	2	-	5
„ David Landsborough, Kilmarnock,	1	-	5
„ P. W. Robertson, Kilmarnock,	1	-	5
„ Peter M'Leish, Dunlop,	1	-	5
Mr William Howison Craufurd of Craufurdland,	-	-	5
„ P. B. Mure Macredie of Perceton,	-	-	5
„ William Chalmers, Dalry,	-	-	5
„ James Clelland, Knockinglaw, Kilmarnock,	1	-	5
„ John Arbuckle, Kilmarnock,	1	-	5
„ William Sommervail, Hapland, Dunlop,	1	-	-
„ Hugh Alexander, banker, Irvine,	1	-	5
„ John Dickie, Provost of Kilmarnock,	1	-	5

Presbytery of Paisley.

Rev. John G. Cunningham, Lochwinnoch,	2	4	-
„ James Macgregor, Paisley,	1	-	5
„ Neil Brodie, Pollockshaws,	1	-	6
„ Ivie M. Maclachlan, Barrhead,	1	-	5
„ Andrew M'Turk, Inchinnan,	1	-	5
Mr Andrew Carnduff, smith, Howwood,	-	-	-
„ Thomas Walker, writer, Paisley,	1	-	5
„ Nathaniel Ramsay, measurer, Glasgow,	1	-	-
„ John M'Indoe, calico printer, Gateside,	1	-	-
„ James Adam, farmer, Barnhill,	-	-	-

Presbytery of Greenock.

Rev. James Stark, Greenock,	-	3	6
„ Charles Watson, Largs,	1	-	5
„ David Boyd, Greenock,	1	-	5
„ Robert R. Caldwell, Erskine,	2	-	-
„ William Bell, Port-Glasgow,	1	-	5
Mr Archibald Scott, merchant, Millport,	1	-	5
„ Alexander Stewart, banker, Wemyss Bay,	1	-	-
„ Alexander Swan, engineer, Greenock,	1	-	5
„ John Banks, missionary, Greenock,	1	-	5
„ Adam Patrick, leather merchant, Greenock,	1	-	5

1st	2d	3d
Div.	Div.	Div.

Presbytery of Hamilton.

Rev. William Buchan, Hamilton,	1	-	5
„ Alexander Rankin, Strathaven,	-	-	5
„ Robert Wylie Lawson, High Church, Airdrie,	1	-	5
„ William K. Hamilton, Stonehouse,	1	3	6
„ John Henderson, Coatbridge,	1	-	5
„ Hugh Jaffrey, Holytown	2	-	-
Mr John Hunter, W.S., L.L.D.	-	-	-
„ D. Simpson, coal master, Airdrie,	1	3	6
„ John Goodwin, Fairfield Lodge, Bothwell,	1	-	5
„ James Lamont, merchant, Glasgow,	1	-	5
„ Allan Struthers, farmer, Broomfield,	1	3	6
„ William Strang,	-	-	-

Presbytery of Lanark.

Rev. Robert Logan, Abington and Craufordjohn,	1	-	5
„ James Walker, Carnwath,	1	-	5
Mr John Cowan, Beeslack, Penicuik,	1	-	5
„ Hugh Marr, architect, Lanark	-	-	-

Presbytery of Dumbarton.

Rev. A. Anderson, West Church, Helensburgh,	1	-	5
„ A. B. Bruce, Cardross,	-	-	5
„ Alex. Cameron, Gaelic Church, Renton,	2	3	6
„ John Tully, Bonhill,	1	-	5
„ John Tait, Dumbarton,	1	-	5
„ W. H. Carslaw, Park Church, Helensburgh,	1	-	5
Mr John William Burns of Kilmahew,	1	-	5
„ F. H. Pattison, of Mount Blow,	-	-	5
„ William Campbell, of Woodbank,	1	-	5
„ Peter Denny, of Helenslee,	1	-	-
„ William Mackie, missionary, Helensburgh,	-	-	5
„ William Reid, Dhuhill, Helensburgh,	1	-	-

Presbytery of Glasgow.

Rev. Dr John Roxburgh, Glasgow,	-	-	-
„ Dr Robert Buchanan, Glasgow,	-	-	5
„ Dr John Forbes, Glasgow,	-	3	6
„ Dr James Gibson, Professor of Divinity and Church History, Free College, Glasgow,	-	3	6
„ Dr James Henderson, Glasgow,	-	-	5
„ Dr John G. Lorimer, Glasgow,	-	-	5
„ George G. M'Leod, Glasgow,	-	-	-
„ Alexander Whyte, Glasgow,	-	-	5
„ Ralph C. Smith, Glasgow,	-	4	6
„ Robert Gault, Glasgow,	-	3	6
„ James Findlay, Camlachie,	-	-	-j
„ James Johnston, Glasgow,	-	-	5
„ Dr Alexander S. Patterson, Glasgow,	-	-	5
„ Richard Waterston, Glasgow,	-	-	5
„ Alexander N. Somerville, Glasgow,	-	-	5
„ Hugh M'Millan, Glasgow,	-	-	5
„ David Menzies, Glasgow,	-	-	5
„ Alexander Wilson, Bridgeton,	-	-	-
„ Dr G. C. M. Douglas, Professor of Hebrew and Old Testament Exegesis, Free Church College, Glasgow,	-	-	5
„ Archibald M'Dougall, Glasgow,	-	-	5
„ Hugh S. Paterson, M.D., Glasgow,	-	4	6
„ Robert Bremner, Glasgow,	-	4	6
„ David Cunningham, Kirkintilloch,	-	-	-

	1st Div.	2d Div.	3d Div.
Mr William Lochhead, merchant, Glasgow,	1	-	5
„ William Geddes, merchant, Cathcart,	2	3	6
„ William Keddie, Lecturer on Natural Science, Free Church College, Glasgow,	1	-	5
„ Peter Wilson, engineer, Glasgow	1	-	5
„ George W. Rainey, merchant, Glasgow,	-	-	5
„ John Blackie, jun., publisher, Glasgow,	-	-	5
„ Alexander Reith, accountant, Glasgow,	-	4	6
„ James White, optician, Glasgow,	-	4	6
„ Robert Baird, merchant, Glasgow,	1	-	5
„ John King, merchant, Glasgow,	-	-	5
„ J. Galbraith, Sheriff-Substitute of Lanarkshire,	-	-	-
„ Michael Connal, merchant, Glasgow,	1	4	6
„ William Scott, merchant, Glasgow,	1	-	-
„ Robert Donald, Clerk to Income-Tax Commissioners for City of Glasgow,	-	-	-
„ John R. Lamb, merchant, Glasgow,	1	-	5
„ John Donald, teacher, Glasgow,	-	-	-
„ Walter Macfarlane, ironfounder, Glasgow,	-	-	5
„ Thomas W. Brown, merchant, Glasgow,	-	-	5
„ William Miller, merchant, Glasgow,	1	-	5
„ James Bryden, house painter, Glasgow,	-	-	-
„ John Laughland, merchant, Glasgow,	-	-	-
„ Robert Connell, plumber, Glasgow,	1	-	-
„ Robert Stevenson, road surveyor, Kirkintilloch,	-	-	5
Synod of Argyll.			
<i>Presbytery of Dunoon and Inverary.</i>			
Rev. Dr Charles C. Mcintosh, Dunoon,	-	-	5
„ Alexander Macbride, North Bute,	-	3	6
„ William Fraser, Lochgilphead,	2	4	6
„ Alexander Ferguson, North Knapdale,	2	3	6
„ Angus Stewart, Kilmartin,	2	4	6
„ Joseph Davidson, East Parish, Rothesay,	1	-	5
Mr Archibald Oswald, merchant, Dunoon,	1	-	5
„ Thomas Stevenson, farmer, North Bute,	-	-	-
„ Donald Graham, farmer, North Knapdale,	-	-	-
„ Peter Sinclair, merchant, Kilmartin,	-	-	-
„ D. Macbeth, Sheriff-Clerk of Buteshire,	1	4	6
„ John Thomson, feuar, Rothesay,	2	4	6
<i>Presbytery of Kintyre.</i>			
Rev. John Campbell, Tarbert,	2	3	6
„ Alexander Munro, Campbeltown,	-	4	6
„ James Gillies, Kilberry,	2	4	6
Mr R. Aitken, farmer, Dromore, Campbeltown,	2	-	-
„ Archibald McLean, teacher, Drumlemble,	2	-	-
„ Archibald Bell, merchant, Killberry,	-	-	-
<i>Presbytery of Islay.</i>			
Rev. James Pearson, Killarrow and Kilmany,	-	3	6
Mr G. L. Walker of Garemount, Dumbartonshire,	-	-	5
<i>Presbytery of Lorn and Mull.</i>			
Rev. Duncan Graham, Kilbrandon,	-	4	5
„ John Sutherland, Ardchattan,	1	-	5
„ Thomas Mackenzie, Muckairn,	2	-	-
„ Patrick Cameron, Oban,	1	-	5
Mr James Cumming, LL.D., one of Her Majesty's In- spectors of Schools, Edinburgh,	1	-	5
„ Gilbert Beith, Woodlands Terrace, Glasgow,	1	-	5
„ John Clerk, Kilbrandon,	-	-	-
„ Duncan Paterson, Oban,	2	3	6

Synod of Perth and Stirling.

1st 2d 3d
Div. Div. Div.*Presbytery of Stirling.*

Rev. Alex. Leitch, Stirling, (South),	-	-	-
„ John Wright, Alloa, (East),	2	-	5
„ P. Sawers, Gargunnoch and Kincardine of Menteith,	-	4	6
„ Robert M'Corke, St Ninians,	2	3	-
„ John M'Leod, minister at Alloa, (West),	2	-	5
„ Mr Robert Downie, farmer, Hillhead, near Stirling,	2	-	-
„ Thomas Miller of Myres, St Ninians,	1	-	-
„ Matthew Brydie, merchant, Alloa,	-	-	5
„ William Macqueen, merchant, Alloa,	-	-	-
„ Alex. Crowe, photographer, Stirling,	1	-	5

Presbytery of Dunblane.

Rev. Patrick T. Muirhead, Kippen,	-	3	6
„ Alexander W. Morris, Buckleyvie,	-	-	5
„ Thomas Hislop, Doune,	-	3	6
„ John A. Anderson, Kilmadock,	1	-	5
„ Mr John Bain of Norriston,	-	4	6
„ John Dunn, merchant, Dunblane,	1	-	5
„ Robert M'Laren, farmer, Annie,	1	-	5
„ David Black, farmer, South Flanders,	-	-	-

Presbytery of Dunkeld.

Rev. John A. Cooke, Auchtergaven,	1	-	5
„ C. Macpherson, Dalguise and Strathbraan,	-	-	5
„ Alexander Gordon, Lethendy,	1	-	5
„ George D. Low, Clunie,	1	-	5
„ The Right Hon. the Earl of Dalhousie, Brechin Castle,	-	-	-
„ Mr George F. Barbour of Bonskeid,	1	-	5
„ William Low, merchant, Dunkeld,	1	-	-
„ Neil Robertson, farmer, Borrennich,	2	-	-

Presbytery of Breadalbane.

Rev. Allan Sinclair, Kenmore,	2	-	5
„ D. G. R. Munro, Logierait,	1	-	5
„ D. M. Connell, Fortingal,	2	-	5
„ Mr Duncan M'Callum, farmer, Glenlyon,	1	-	-
„ R. Balfour, Secretary of the City of Glasgow Assurance Company, Edinburgh,	1	-	5
„ Allan Stewart of Bunrannoch, Strathgarry,	1	-	5

Presbytery of Perth.

Rev. Dr James Grierson, Errol,	1	-	5
„ John M'Leish, Methven,	-	-	5
„ Robert Cowan, Perth,	1	-	5
„ Robert Stevenson, Abernethy,	1	-	5
„ John Young, Argask,	2	-	5
„ Charles Calder Stewart, Scone,	1	-	5
„ Mr William S. Turnbull of Huntingtower,	1	-	5
„ Major R. C. Craigie of Glendoick,	1	-	-
„ Mr Alexander Reid, labourer, Perth,	1	-	5
„ Peter Robertson, merchant, Perth,	-	-	5
„ Peter Scott, Kinvaid, Moneydie,	-	-	-
„ James Marshall, clothier, Methven,	-	-	5

Presbytery of Auchterarder.

Rev. Thomas Gunn, Madderty,	-	4	6
„ Duncan M'Laren, Dunning,	-	-	5
„ William Milne, Auchterarder,	1	4	5
„ Mr William Thomson of Balgowan,	1	-	5
„ John M'Leish, banker, Crieff,	1	-	5
„ John Comrie, Keir Cottage, Braco,	-	-	-

	1st Div.	2d Div.	3d Div.
Presbyteries in India.			
<i>Calcutta.</i>			
Rev. Jagadishwar Bhattacharjya, Mahanad,	.	.	.
Dr Alexander Duff,	.	.	.
<i>Madras.</i>			
Rev. Alexander Blake,	.	.	.
Rev. John Braidwood,	.	.	5
<i>Bombay.</i>			
Rev. James Wardrop Gardner, Poona,	.	.	1
Mr Hugh Miller, M.D.,	.	.	1
Presbytery of the North of Italy.			
Rev. John R. M'Dougall, Florence,	.	.	.
„ Alexander Burn Murdoch, Nice,	.	.	.
„ Theodore J. Meyer, Ancona,	.	.	.
Mr Andrew Jameson, Sheriff of Aberdeenshire,	.	.	5
„ Alexander Rankine, residing at No. 18 Via San Sebastiano, Florence,	.	.	.
Presbytery of Caffraria.			
Rev. James Laing, Burnshill,	.	.	.
Mr William Kidston, merchant, Glasgow,	.	.	2 4 6

PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE FREE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND.

THURSDAY, MAY 23, 1867.

THE Assembly met at noon in the Assembly Hall, which was crowded in all parts. The Rev. W. Wilson, Dundee, the retiring Moderator, preached the opening sermon from Ephesians ii. 18—"For through Him we both have access by one Spirit to the Father."

Public worship being concluded, the Assembly was constituted with prayer by the Moderator.

ELECTION OF MODERATOR.

The CLERK having read the roll of members,

Mr WILSON said—Fathers and Brethren,—The time has now come for my retiring from that position to which the kindness of last General Assembly raised me twelve months ago. I am very grateful for the regard then shown me, and for all the forbearance exercised towards me, in an Assembly associated with such happy memories. According to established usage, there is only one further duty which devolves upon me before I leave this chair. It falls to me to propose one for your acceptance to preside over the meetings of this Assembly. It is a relief to me that in making that proposal, I do not act on my own responsibility, but as the organ of others. In these circumstances, I feel it to be a high privilege to propose as the Moderator of this Assembly so old and tried a friend as the Rev. Dr Roxburgh, of Glasgow—(applause)—with whom, both before the Disruption and since, I have been associated in many kinds of labour. Dr Roxburgh's claims to the honour which I propose should be conferred on him are undoubted and eminent. He has been distinguished throughout all his career as a laborious, faithful, and successful minister. And, apart from his work as a pastor, he has earned the esteem and grateful regard of the whole Church by his labours in connexion with the cause of Home Missions and Church Extension. (Applause.) These labours have characterised the whole of his life as a pastor. In the earliest years of his ministry he was mainly

instrumental in rearing what will be an ever-during monument of his zeal and success. St Peter's Church, in Dundee, the scene of Robert M'Cheyne's most prosperous ministry, may be said to owe its existence to Dr Roxburgh. Nor during his laborious ministry in Glasgow has his zeal in the same great cause abated. Not only as convener of the Glasgow Evangelisation Committee, but afterwards as my predecessor in the office I now hold, as convener of the Home Mission Committee, he has done noble work for the Church. We cannot forget what an impulse was given to Home Mission enterprise under his convenership, nor those addresses by which, from year to year, he so interested the Assembly and the Church, and gained a foremost place in many hearts for the cause he advocated. I am sure I need say no more, if indeed it was necessary to say so much, to commend Dr Roxburgh to the acceptance of this Assembly. I have very peculiar satisfaction in moving his appointment as Moderator. (Loud applause.)

The motion was cordially and unanimously agreed to, and the Moderator-elect, having been introduced by Dr Candlish and Dr Buchanan, took the chair.

Moderator's Address.

The MODERATOR delivered the following address:—Fathers and brethren,—I return you my unfeigned thanks for the kindness which has placed me in this chair, filled in time past by a succession of distinguished predecessors. To have a place on the roll of moderators of the Free Church of Scotland, containing so many revered and honoured names, is a distinction which I had not ventured to anticipate, and did not presume to aspire after. I am deeply sensible of my insufficiency for the adequate discharge of the duties of the office, and must crave a more than usual amount of your indulgence. I am little versed in the forms of ecclesiastical procedure, and have had little experience in presiding over the deliberations of large assemblies. But I know that you will cordially aid whatever efforts may be necessary to maintain the dignity and orderliness of your proceedings; and I rely on the kindness of the brethren who surround this table to favour me with their counsel as circumstances may require. Let me ask also that in the case of protracted and exhausting sittings, should my strength prove unequal to the fatigue, the Assembly will not deem me wanting in respect if I request to be relieved by a brother more able than myself. (Applause.) May the great Master of assemblies Himself preside over our deliberations. Conducted in His name, in dependence on His Spirit, and under a sense of accountability to Him as our sole Head, may all our things be done with charity, and so as to advance His glory, and the edification of His Church. Our meeting this day reminds us that this Church has entered on the twenty-fifth year of its history in its disestablished state. A generation, nearly, has gone and come since the Disruption. No one who was privileged to share personally in the conflict that issued in that memorable event, and in the subsequent labour of rebuilding the walls of our Zion, can recall, without wonder and praise, all the ways by which God has led us from first to last. Looking back now from the comparative tranquillity of these later years, it requires an effort to realise the life and energy that distinguished our proceedings during that eventful period, and the intense and wide-spread interest which they awakened, when the very exist-

ence of our Church seemed imperilled, and such men as Chalmers, and Welsh, and Gordon, and Dr Patrick M'Farlane, and William Cunningham, and Andrew Gray, were among the foremost actors on the scene. The shadows of those stirring times are fast becoming long-extended and low-levelled. And one loves to linger on the remembrance of the great and good men, the echoes of whose once familiar voices seem still to fall on our ear; and on the remembrance of those days when, in common with them, we felt conscious that God was literally leading us "by a way we knew not, and in paths that we did not know, and was making darkness light before us." For, as has been often and truly remarked, while each step was made plain in the light of duty and conscience, as the time arrived for taking it, no one could have anticipated it, nor could calculate what the next step would be. "We went out, not knowing whither we went;" knowing this only, that we could not err when following the guidance of Divine Providence, interpreted in the light of Christian principle; and we were suddenly surprised, so to speak, to find ourselves, "through fire and through water, brought out into a wealthy place." Let it also be thankfully remarked how God has not only safely guided us in our disestablished state through manifold difficulties and perplexities arising from without, and has frustrated threatened attempts against our spiritual jurisdiction, but has more than once delivered us from internal controversies, which threatened at the time to sow the seeds of discord among brethren, and to rend the peace of the Church. And now, after the expiry of nearly a quarter of a century, we remain this day, by His good hand upon us a united Church—united not only by a common profession, but in the bonds of Christian affection—a Church comprising about twice the number of congregations we started with in 1843—tolerated by the State in the full exercise of its spiritual freedom—not vexed by inward divisions, nor having any cause of lasting disturbance or alienation in the midst of it—but all of us, as I verily believe, "standing fast in one spirit, and with one mind striving together for the faith of the gospel." Thus, every year added to our history has contributed to our stability, and has given us fresh reason to raise our stone of grateful remembrance, saying, "Hitherto hath the Lord helped us: the Lord hath done great things for us, whereof we are glad." (Applause.) When Joshua "waxed old and stricken in age," we read of his delivering a farewell charge, in which he recounted to the people of Israel God's signal benefits and providences to them and to their fathers, and expressed his concern that God should be honoured and his cause maintained after he was gone. It was a pious and patriotic thing in the venerable leader of his countrymen to feel this solicitude as to the future conduct and condition of those he was leaving behind. And it is natural and reasonable that those who were privileged to take an active part, however humble, in the momentous events to which I have referred, should have similar anxieties as to the future of our beloved Church. By what means are her permanent place and influence in the country to be maintained? How is she not merely to retain, but to improve her position? In what way is her usefulness to be at once perpetuated and extended, and herself made increasingly a blessing to the land and to the world? And how is her progress to be quickened in that course of prosperity on which she has been carried forward hitherto? Assuredly these ends are not to be attained by placing our

dependence on the mere scriptural soundness of our distinctive testimony; and it is matter of congratulation accordingly that the Free Church has never been contented to occupy the position of a mere testifying body. Unspeakably important as it is to maintain Christ's supreme authority as the living and only reigning King in Zion, how must the effect of this precious testimony be neutralised, if we do little to extirpate the power and kingdom of his adversary the devil, to spread His gospel and the glory of His name in the world, and if we ourselves do not give Him the throne of our heart, and submit personally to His government! May the good Lord save us from the withering influence of a barren and unprofitable orthodoxy—an indolent, self-complacent contentment with a creed or confession, because it contains the genuine doctrines of God's Word, while yet these doctrines prompt to no Christian effort, and produce no personal sanctification. We cannot live as a Church on our mere protest against the sins and shortcomings of the Establishment and the encroachments of the civil power. Even if we could, it would prove but unwholesome nutriment. For my own part, when I consider the interests of souls committed to her care, the influence for good or evil which still belongs to her as a national institution, and the desire for one another's welfare that ought to subsist among the disciples of Christ of all denominations, I would rejoice to see the Established Church returning to her first love, and complying with the divine admonition, "Remember from whence thou art fallen, and repent, and do the first works." (Applause.) It is natural for us, and it is lawful, to desire with peculiar earnestness the prosperity of our own communion; but this always in charitable good will to others, and in so far as is compatible with the purity and prosperity of the Church universal. And if we may not make a pillow of our Church's testimony on which to go to sleep, so neither may we repose on past attainments and the reputation already won. The same law of the kingdom of grace which obtains with regard to the individual believer is applicable to Churches in their collective capacity; they must grow if they would not decay. Their advancement must be constant and progressive; and one attainment reached must but fire our ambition to press forward toward another. As with the inactive and unexercised soul, so with the Church that has suffered the spirit of Christian enterprise to decline; it becomes dwarfish and stagnant, and its vigour and capacity for usefulness are impaired. Let us then do as a Church what Paul did as an individual—"Forget those things which are behind, and reach forth unto those things which are before." Let us seek to earn the same commendation from our Lord which He bestowed on the Church of Thyatira—"I know thy works, and charity, and service, and faith, and patience; and the last to be more than the first." In one important respect, indeed, those things which are behind are not to be forgotten, but, on the contrary, are to be thankfully cherished in the memory. For, to look back to the times of our Reforming forefathers, and compare our spirit and practice with theirs—with their ardour and faithfulness, their unwavering attachment to the truth of God, and the simple and primitive forms of His worship—their trials and sufferings, and their noble and successful contendings for freedom and independence—this is often an excellent remedy against defection, and an effectual preventive of the corruptions which are ever apt to creep into institutions under the conduct of fallen, erring men. Nor in the case of any Church does this

exercise promise to be attended with more advantage than in that of our own—a Church singularly apostolic and spiritual in her creed, constitution, and discipline, as laid down at the Reformation; and which requires nothing, with a view to the utmost purity and perfection that can be realised on earth, than that we carry out the principles and rules which were then derived freshly and directly from the Word of God. Hence it is not a matter of mere sentiment, but a dictate of practical wisdom, that we should maintain the historical character of the Free Church as the Church of the Scottish Reformation, the free hereditary of the Church of Scotland. (Applause.) But now suffer me to suggest, with all deference, what I conceive to be the necessary conditions of that progress and prosperity which we all so earnestly desire may continue to distinguish the future history of our Church. These are—1. Spiritual life; 2. Ministerial fidelity; 3. Missionary zeal. Let it not be supposed that I mean to assume the office of an instructor on these sacred themes. Nevertheless, having a respect to those on whom, in the course of nature, the conduct of our Church's affairs must ere long devolve, it may not be out of place to indicate, however imperfectly, what may be styled the articles of an advancing or declining Church, on the observance of which it shall depend whether the future of the Free Church shall be worthy of her past—yea, her latter end more blessed than her beginning. 1. First of all, without spiritual life all ministerial and pastoral work becomes constrained and mechanical. Like every duty which does not fall in with our likings, and for which we have no personal fitness, it soon proves a weariness and a drudgery; whereas, when the servant of Christ goeth forth unto his work and to his labour in the grateful, happy spirit of a man accepted of God, and in whom Christ himself dwells as the principle of life and action, and the hope of glory, what heavenly vigour inspires him, and how does the power of the gospel manifested by him exercise a more commanding and lasting influence than even learning and genius and eloquence! As nothing short of the salvation of souls will be the aim of such a one, so nothing short of it will satisfy him as the fruit and reward of his labours. Much has been justly spoken of the need of a *learned* ministry, to lend authority to the pulpit, and to defend the bulwarks of the Christian faith against the heresies and sceptical speculations of these perilous times; and of the need of a *laborious* ministry, to overtake the wants of a vast and increasing population, with its thousand claims on the attentions and services of its religious instructors. But unless the *learning* and the *labour* are consecrated by union with a *living* ministry, can we warrantably anticipate spiritual fruit from the one or the other? Nor need we go far in order to find admirable models of vital personal religion, varied in its manifestation by natural temperament and character. The recent records of our own Church furnish the noblest examples of personal holiness, large-hearted benevolence, Christian magnanimity, and apostolic fervour. My own personal associations and recollections will account for the selection of the following instances, from among many, as eminent types of Christian character:—The saintly M'Cheyne, my early friend and associate, whose habitually-devout spirit breathed in all that he said and did, and imparted a permanent interest to every line that he penned; Dr Chalmers, a man majestic in his simplicity; whose large soul abounded with the most generous sympathies; not more remarkable for the grandeur of his intellect and the fervour of

his eloquence than for the glowing benevolence and affection of a sanctified heart ; and who, many and distinguished as in his day were the names of the morally great and noble in our ranks, did overshadow and eclipse them all : Dr Thomas Brown, the revered father of his people, whose character beautifully combined the spirit at once of the patriarch and the apostle, and to know whom was to love and venerate him : Dr Patrick M'Farlan, a man distinguished by remarkable strength and purity of Christian principle, and of unswerving consistency ; who held his views with the tenacity of an honest and honourable mind, because conscious they were deliberately and honestly adopted ; who expressed them with singular clearness and felicity, and maintained them always in a high spirit of Christian courtesy. And my beloved friend Dr John Smyth—one who in every relation of life adorned the Christian profession and the ministerial office, and of whom an esteemed elder of this Church once said to me, that no minister of his day did more to promote a respect for religion and its teachers among the commercial classes of Glasgow, and this mainly by his loving spirit and the silent influence of his life and walk as a living epistle of Christ. Honoured and blessed be the memory of the worthy dead ! Soon must we follow them to the land of forgetfulness. May we follow them while here in righteousness, godliness, love, patience, meekness !

2. The subject of ministerial fidelity, to which I adverted as a second element of a Church's prosperity, reminds us that as even eminent public services on the part of a minister of Christ will not excuse a neglect of pastoral duty, so, on the other hand, the great body of our ministers, who may feel incompetent to lead or advise in the conduct of ecclesiastical affairs, may yet warrantably encourage themselves with the thought, that, by an efficient spiritual husbandry, each in his assigned portion of the vineyard, they are engaged in a work which, if prayerfully and diligently prosecuted over the nine hundred and twenty congregations of our Church, and blessed with a plenteous shower of the Spirit, may go far to convert our beloved Scotland into a spiritual Eden. After all, it is in the parish, and not in the Presbytery, that the real work of the Church is done. Indeed, I am not sure that it has not been sometimes unhappily more hindered than helped in the Presbytery. (A laugh.) Those who know us not intimately, and who see only the Presbyterial side of us, are tempted occasionally to misjudge it. They forget that our affairs are not managed by the silent authority of a bishop, nor in the privacy of a congregational meeting ; but that every matter that affects us is subjected to the ordeal of a free and full discussion in open court. And so, when the blast of controversy "lends the eye a terrible aspect, stiffens the sinews, and summons up the blood," they too readily conclude that Presbyterian human nature is somehow more stormy than Episcopalian or Congregational human nature, or that our ecclesiastical constitution might advantageously be exchanged for a system more favourable to the display of such fruits of the Spirit as love, gentleness, and meekness. (Laughter.) This is, of course, a mistake on their part. (Applause.) In all seriousness, however, it is one into which we should never give them occasion to fall. "My brethren, these things ought not so to be." (Hear, hear.) But to return from this digression. Of what infinite value to the Church in every age has been the example of the great Apostle of the Gentiles, the grand model of ministerial fidelity ! Perhaps it was from the just confidence with which he could call on others

to "follow, as they had him for an ensample," that appeals at once as to the blameless manner of his life, and his faithfulness and diligence in the direct work of the ministry, abound in his epistles and discourses, while they neither are found in the other epistles of the New Testament, nor are frequent in the writings of other pious men. Who ever served God and warned sinners as he did, "night and day with tears"—tears of solicitude for their salvation, of pity for their impenitence, of distress for the dishonour done by them to God! Who could warrantably speak as he did of the "affliction and anguish of heart," and the "weeping," with which he regarded the falls and inconsistencies of professing Christians! What unimpeachable disinterestedness marked the character of him who testified of himself, "I have coveted no man's silver, or gold, or apparel!" With what patience did he endure, "for the elect's sakes," trials and difficulties which would have cooled the ardour of one less animated by love to Christ and to souls! With what unequalled diligence and earnestness did he press home the truth of God on the hearts of the people, adding to his public expositions in the synagogue close personal dealings with them in their own houses—warning, expostulating, entreating—resolved not to let them go until Christ had blessed them! Justly might such a man take them to record—and so may every servant of Christ who follows the apostle, at however long an interval, in his unbending fidelity and affection and tenderness of heart—"I am pure from the blood of all men." It seems a thing incredible that a ministry conducted in such a spirit should fail to be crowned with a signal blessing from on high. (Hear, hear.) 3. The last topic to which I purposed briefly to allude was missionary zeal viewed as the test of the power of religion in a Church. As respects this attribute of a living Church, there has been much in our history to call for lively gratitude, and there is much to humble us. Who must not feel thankful for the proportions which our Home Mission work has of late years assumed, and the energy and success with which it is prosecuted in all its branches? The same thing may be said of the three standard schemes—the Jewish, the Colonial, and Continental. Especially does it become us to acknowledge how graciously God has honoured and blessed our efforts in the case of our Foreign Mission Scheme, when we compare the scale on which it is now conducted—its headquarters in all the leading cities of India; its seventy stations, Indian and African; its 189 agents, European and native, as at last Assembly; and its annual revenue from all sources, home and foreign, of upwards of £30,000;—when, I say, we compare this extent of operations with the day of small things, when the venerable Convener of our Foreign Mission Committee, then in his prime, embarked single-handed on the apparently hopeless enterprise of conquering India for the Lord. (Cheers.) Yet the humbling fact remains, that the average rate of contribution to the scheme is somewhat under 10d. a year from each member of our Church. This shows what an urgent call there is for fervent and persevering prayer, that the Lord would increase the measure of the Church's faith, and devotedness, and liberality in the great cause of the world's evangelisation. It discovers how little as yet we have understood and embraced in all its fulness that the "field is the world." Is it not at the same time like the discovery of an unwrought mine of gold, which, if diligently worked, may furnish in the future ample funds for the extension of our missions to the heathen? Assuredly,

if there is a Church on earth that ought more than another to be identified with the cause of missions to Jew and Gentile, that Church is our own. For not only has God constituted us, in common with other Christian Churches, the depositaries of Divine truth and religious knowledge, and charged us to "go into all the world and preach the gospel of Him in whom all the kindreds of the earth are to be blessed;" but let the memorable fact never be forgotten, that at the period of the Disruption our missionaries, both in Africa and India, without an exception, declared their conscientious adherence to the principles of the Free Church, and their determination, in the strength of God, to share with us in whatever trials and sacrifices might be incurred in the maintenance of them. It is impossible to estimate to what extent this step on their part contributed at the time, and has contributed since, to the strength and prosperity of our Church, and to recommend our principles, as associated with the honour of the Redeemer and the advancement of His kingdom. Not only was it a high and edifying example of faith and devotedness; it, moreover, stamped on the Free Church, from the very outset, the character of a missionary Church. In this it rendered us an incalculable and a permanent service. For a spirit of missionary zeal and energy is not only an effect, but a cause of spiritual vitality. It reacts on the life and vigour of the Church at home; and a concentrated blessing is returned into her own bosom from a world embraced in the arms of her Christian compassion. I do not hesitate therefore to give it a foremost place among the elements of religious progress and prosperity; and woe to us if we suffer it to decline! Such a disaster would be the symptom either of narrow views and a degenerate spirit, unworthy of the past history of our Church, or of an inward principle of debility and decay already at work within her—an idea too painful to contemplate. Let us hope that the establishment of a Chair of Evangelistic Theology, and the character of the prelections that shall be delivered from it, may have the happy effect of at once perpetuating and intensifying the interest alike of our students and people in the conversion of the world to Christ; that from among the former there may never be wanting willing labourers to overtake the work which God may lay to our hands; and that from the latter there may never be wanting the perennial liberality necessary for the suitable support of such labourers. For it were unreasonable in our people to expect that, if they withhold their means, others should devote their lives to a cause which has common claims on all who bear the Christian name. (Applause.) Fathers and brethren,—I must apologise for having detained you so long. But when one recalls what to him was the grandest event of his time, with its impressions and lessons, it is difficult to practise brevity, and perhaps to escape the charge of being somewhat desultory and discursive. As the sum of what I have said, or wished to say, does any one ask, What in some future period will be the state of our beloved Church? Of it, too, shall it be said, as of so many other Churches, It is no more? Or shall it dwindle and shrink until the life has gone out of it? Or shall it continue to flourish as a preserving salt in the land, and an honoured instrument for diffusing the benefits of knowledge and the blessings of religion? I answer, This, under God, depends on the faithfulness and fruitfulness of ourselves and of those who are to succeed us. It depends on our personal holiness and purity. It depends on our ministerial

fidelity, on our warmth or coldness in what concerns Christ's glory as connected with the maintenance and propagation of His truth. And it depends on our zealous performance or guilty neglect of the duty we owe to the ignorant, debased, and perishing heathen at home and abroad. If a healthy, vigorous, and active Christianity be not sustained among us—if we settle down contented with the enjoyment of our own spiritual satisfactions, and without a lively and operative sense that God has intrusted us with a mission to a world lying in wickedness—then may we be justly startled by such words as these, “Enlargement and deliverance shall arise from another place, but thou and thy father's house shall be destroyed.” For, under the righteous government of God, no valuable blessing is won, or can be retained, without labour and faithfulness, patience and sacrifice—(hear, hear.) And, fathers and brethren, it is not possible to stand in this place, and to look around on this Free Assembly, without an expression of gratitude to God for our liberty to prosecute without let or hindrance the spiritual ends and objects for which the Church of Christ has been divinely set up in our world. If we fail in the fulfilment of the duties incumbent on us, we cannot allege in excuse that our Church is denied the exercise of any of the powers bestowed on her by her Divine Head. When we mark the bondage by which the free action of many Churches is impeded, and the divisions which distract them—when in the Church of England, for example, we see Ritualism spreading on the one hand, and Rationalism on the other, and church-rulers utterly powerless to arrest their progress—and when we see evangelical truth, in the person of its friends, seeking to nestle in an uncongenial home, and in the company of unworthy associates, we can contemplate without alarm the probable issue of things so incongruous, and so injurious to the interests of the pure doctrine of God's Word. From our personal experience we can promise the faithful ministers and people of our common Lord that, in the event of a dissolution of their connexion with the State, they will have no cause of lamentation. They will be introduced into a region wherein, with their loyalty to their Queen unquenched—burning rather with a brighter flame—they shall breathe the air of spiritual freedom, and, as Christ's servants, acknowledging His sole sovereignty in His Church, shall enjoy an independence and liberty of action, with the value of which the emoluments of the richest Establishment are not worthy to be compared. (Loud applause.) As for ourselves, let us continue to “stand fast in this liberty wherewith Christ has made us free, and be not entangled again with the yoke of bondage.” And if it is allowable for me to give utterance here to my personal longings, I would add, let us endeavour to prosecute to a happy consummation, in accordance with the claims of truth and love, a cordial union with the other Churches of our native land, which, rejoicing with us in the same spiritual ancestry, and inheriting the faith of Calvin and Knox, hold as firmly as ourselves the sole headship of Christ, and our other distinctive Presbyterian doctrines and principles; that so, with our resources duly husbanded, and our energies concentrated, we may stand together for the mutual defence of our liberties, may make common inroad against the enemy of souls at home and in heathen lands, and may, with the blessing of God, transmit our religious rights and privileges unimpaired to the generations following. (Applause.) From such a union may we not warrantably anticipate, in addition to other advantages, such

an impulse to the cause of vital godliness in the land, and such an enlargement of its sphere of influence, as shall go far to prevent or cure the sordidness, the worldliness, and the enervating luxuriousness, which are to be dreaded as the baleful fruit of ever-increasing but unsanctified wealth. The most effectual antidote to that love of money which is the root of all evil, is to have the heart of the community inflamed, expanded, and invigorated through love to Christ and His cause. And this end, so devoutly to be wished, is most likely to be achieved by the Church when her scattered members, one in doctrine and discipline, shall be one also in visible communion, "walking in the fear of the Lord, and in the comfort of the Holy Ghost, and having favour with all the people." (Loud applause.)

ADDRESS TO HER MAJESTY.

Mr WILSON, late Moderator, moved that the Assembly appoint the following members as a committee to prepare a loyal address to her Majesty :—The Moderator, Mr Wilson, and Mr C. S. Murray Dunlop, M.P. (elder.)

The motion was agreed to.

After the appointment of the Committee on Arrangement of Business, the Committee on Bills, and the Committee on Overtures, the Assembly adjourned.

FRIDAY, MAY 24.

The General Assembly met at one o'clock. The greater portion of the sederunt was, as usual, occupied in devotional exercises, which were conducted by the Moderator, Mr Wood of Elie, Professor Douglas, and Mr Somerville of Glasgow.

ASSEMBLY SERMONS.

The Assembly Arrangements Committee recommended to the Assembly the following minute as to appointments to preach in the hall during its sittings, viz. :—The General Assembly hereby appoint Mr John Adam, minister at Aberdeen, to lecture and preach in the hall at the forenoon diet of Sabbath the 26th of May; Mr A. B. Bruce, minister at Cardross, to preach there in the afternoon; and Mr James MacGregor, minister at Paisley, in the evening of the same day. The Assembly also instruct Mr Adam, when preaching in the hall on the 26th of May, to advocate the claims of the Society for the Benefit of the Sons and Daughters of the Clergy. The Assembly also appoint Mr Andrew Cameron, minister at Maryton, to preach and lecture in the hall at the forenoon diet of Sabbath the 2d of June; Mr Hugh M'Millan, minister at Glasgow, in the afternoon; and Mr Alexander Whyte, minister at Glasgow, in the evening of the same day. The minute was adopted.

IRISH PRESBYTERIAN ASSEMBLY.

The Assembly also heard the report of the same committee with reference to a deputation to the General Assembly of the Presbyterian

Church of Ireland, to meet on the 3d of June next, and with reference to the vacancy in the office of precentor to the Assembly. The Assembly approved of the report as regards these matters, authorise the Committee on Assembly Arrangements to name a deputation to the Assembly in Ireland at a future diet, and hereby appoint Mr Walter Strang, precentor to the Assembly and its Commission, in room of the late much regretted Mr Hately.

REPORT ON COLLECTIONS.

The Assembly called for the schedules and lists anent collections, and for the report and statement of the clerks thereanent, in terms of the deliverances of the Assembly in 1860 and 1864. The schedules and lists were produced, and laid on the table. A statement thereanent on the part of the clerks was read by Sir Henry Moncreiff as follows:—
“The whole contributions from our congregations towards the spread of the gospel and the religious instruction of the people, by means of the Assembly collections, have this year amounted to the sum of £20,473, 1s. The whole amount last year was £20,750, 15s. 8d., leaving a balance in favour of last year of £277, 14s. 8d. The number of failures to collect was—

	Last Year.	This Year.
For the Home Mission,	29	27
„ Foreign Missions,	22	13
„ College Fund,	41	26
„ Conversion of the Jews,	23	18
„ Colonial Department of the Colonial and Continental Scheme, }	21	35

It thus appears that the collection for the Colonial Scheme is the only one of the fixed annual collections for permanent objects, which shows a greater number of failures than occurred last year. The number of failures is less in all the others, and very considerably less as regards the College Fund, and the fund for Foreign Missions. The failures to collect for the College Fund are, in some cases, left unaccounted for. In others, it appears that collections were made, though not returned in time. In a third class, the statement is that the congregations were collecting for the liquidation of debt, or local purposes of a temporary or emergent kind, and in one case there is no other statement except that the minister was absent from the meeting of Presbytery. The 13 failures to collect for the Foreign Missions are all accounted for in a hopeful manner, except in one instance, in which the somewhat unsatisfactory statement is made, that all resources are required for the ordinary expenses; and two instances in which no reason is given, the want of a reason in one of them being caused by the absence of the minister from the Presbytery. The 18 apparent failures to collect for the Conversion of the Jews are all accounted for, either by the collection having been made but not reported in time, or by temporary causes which are not likely to operate again, except four cases, in which no reason is given, the absence of the minister from the Presbytery being, in one instance, the occasion of the silence; one case, in which the collection was made, but nothing was obtained beyond the ordinary average; and one case, the same with that

referred to under the previous head, in which all resources are said to be required for ordinary purposes. The 27 failures to collect for the Home Mission have nearly the same proportion of each description of answer given in the schedule, with that in the schedule for the College and Foreign Mission Funds. On the whole, it appears that the requisite attention by ministers, Sessions, and Deacons' Courts, to the Home and Foreign Missions, and to the College and Conversion of the Jews' Funds, has increased during the past year; especially to the Foreign Missions and College Funds. The comparative deficiency of attention, however, to the Colonial department of the Colonial and Continental Fund, has been considerable during the past year. It may, perhaps, be accounted for in part, by the circumstance of there having been this year a special collection for the Continental department of that fund. The failures are generally of the same kind with those already mentioned under former heads, but, of course, more numerous in each class. The same statement is here made again with reference to the one congregation that requires all its resources for ordinary purposes. In three instances the answer is in these words, "Could not get in." The clerks do not profess to explain the exact meaning of this answer. It probably means the same thing with the answer given for two out of these three congregations, as well as for six others in the schedule for the Disruption Ministers' Fund, which is, "Could not get *it* in." In this last-mentioned schedule alone, the answer occurs in a few instances that the object is objected to by the minister, his Deacons' Court, or his people. The state of attention to this object has not improved since last year, the number of apparent failures to collect having been 88 this year, as compared with 84 last year. They are accounted for to a great extent by the same causes as those mentioned with reference to the other schedules. In one instance, the statement is that the collection was interfered with *per incuriam* by another collection. The apparent failures to collect for the Continental Fund were 44 this year, as compared with 42 last year, in the case of the Evangelisation of the Masses at the same period of the year. The answers in the schedule are in proportion much to the same effect with those in the other schedules, except in one case where, strangely enough, with the Act of Assembly in his possession, the minister is said to have made the mistake of thinking that the collection for the Colonial department included that for the Continental. The apparent failures to collect on behalf of the Normal Schools and the Church Building Fund combined were 35, as compared with 23 in the case of the Highlands and Islands last year, at the same period of the year. There is no variation from the other schedules in the answers given, except in one instance, in which the minister could give no reason, but that the people had given so little formerly that the collection was not worth minding.

The Assembly appointed the schedules and lists to be dealt with in terms of the deliverance thereanent in 1860, and the Assembly also renewed all the instructions given by the Assemblies of 1860 and 1864 to the Clerks of Assembly, to Presbyteries, and to Committees.

RELIGION AND MORALS.

Dr J. J. WOOD, Dumfries, gave in the report of the Committee on the State of Religion and Morals, (No. XIX.) The report gives minute details of the evangelistic and revival work which has been going on during the

past year in different districts of the country. These details chiefly comprise communications from ministers in the vicinity of the Forth and Clyde Canal, at Kilsyth, Cumbernauld, Larbert, and Kirriemuir, in which a remarkable awakening has taken place, and many have been added to the Church through the instrumentality of the meetings held in these places. Reference is also made to the work done by the Territorial Churches in Glasgow and Dumfries, chiefly among the non-church-going population of these towns—a work which has been attended with remarkable and gratifying results. To the report is appended statements by the deputations appointed to visit the Synod of Moray and the Synod of Galloway; but these were reserved for consideration at a future diet of Assembly. In submitting the report, Dr Wood observed that an exceedingly interesting work had been going on during the year in many parts of the country. The committee did not think it necessary to issue inquiries to all the ministers of the Church, or even to all the Presbyteries, feeling that an annual inquiry of this kind was apt to become formal on their part, and to receive a formal answer from those to whom it was addressed. They understood, however, that in many parts of the land a very encouraging work of God's grace had been going on, and he was instructed, as convener, to address a note to the ministers of the Free Church in those districts, requesting information regarding the work, which he might lay before the Church. He accordingly communicated with a number of ministers, and received a number of very interesting returns. But he wished the Assembly to understand that what appeared in the report by no means comprehended the whole of the information, or even a considerable portion of it. Since the report had been made up, he had received communications telling him of the work of grace in other places than those mentioned in the report; and from other districts, where there was reason to believe that a work of grace was going on, he had received no communication. He believed, for instance, that in Forfar a very interesting and extensive work was going on, as also in Haddington and Stromness. A slight reference was made in the report to Kirriemuir; and he held in his hand a letter from the minister of Auchterarder, who, while saying it would be premature to give any formal statement, at the same time was convinced that many persons had been awakened, and were giving evidence of a saving change of heart. In that town the revival had been characterised by an absence of excitement. The work had been connected to a large extent with the instrumentality of lay evangelists. He (Dr Wood) had reason to believe similarly interesting movements had taken place in other districts of the country. In the places referred to in the report, ministers and other office-bearers had taken an interest in the movement, and had put themselves at its head, preventing a number of abuses that sometimes were introduced at such seasons. The first result of this movement, and the most gratifying, had been the conversion of souls. From the testimony of the ministers who had communicated with him, it was plain that many souls had been brought to the Saviour, giving evidence of the reality of their conversion by a life and conversation according to godliness. But it was a remarkable thing that over the general community there appeared to have been a sort of awe restraining them from acts of gross wickedness. They experienced that in Dumfries some years ago, when he was informed by the head of the police that he had very little to do; and a similar

state of matters is referred to in some of the communications the committee had now received. He was sorry to say that when the season of revival passed away—when the awe wore off—many returned again, more hardened than ever, to the sins they had loved. Along with so much that was gratifying, there were evils that sprang up, and that required to be guarded against. He thought that by faithfulness in the exercise of discipline and authority a number of those evils complained of and deplored might be prevented. He had reason to believe, from some of the communications, that this had been the case in a number of instances, and that where the office-bearers of the Church really used the authority with which they were invested, and set themselves affectionately and firmly to repress what they regarded as unsound in doctrine or disorderly in conduct, their efforts were crowned with great success. He humbly thought this was a matter deserving the very prayerful attention of every one of them. It was exceedingly sad to find reproach brought on the cause of Christ by extravagances and errors getting in on such interesting occasions as this, and if they could do anything to restrain such extravagances or unsoundness, it was their duty both to watch and to pray and to labour in order that they might accomplish this part of their work. He was impressed with the conviction that it was their duty to endeavour to stir up the individual members of their congregations to do something for the Lord in their several spheres; and he trusted that, not only would they receive from the Lord the spirit of prayer and supplication, but that also they would feel themselves bound to try to do something directly, to bring sinners under the means of grace, and, further, to lead them to think of their perilous condition under the wrath and curse of God. He was persuaded that if their congregations would look upon themselves as centres of aggression upon the heathenism around, they might do a great deal more towards the evangelisation of the land. He was sorry to think that, in speaking of these revival matters, a tone of exaggeration was sometimes used which was not warranted, and which was fitted to do a great deal of mischief. They ought to strive to steer between the two extremes of rejecting too much and of admitting too much. They were bound to receive assistance in the Lord's work from whatever quarter it might come, and they were bound to try the spirits whether they were of God. Many were now speaking for God—many of them valuable auxiliaries of the minister—and their help ought to be received with all thankfulness. But there were others who cast themselves into the work without thinking whether they were qualified or not, and there could be no scruple in refusing the assistance of such, while they received thankfully the assistance of such as taught the truth and who loved God. There ought to be no difficulty in setting aside or refusing to accept the assistance of those whom they found to be unauthorised or unqualified for the work upon which they thrust themselves. In conclusion, Dr Wood said that deputations had been appointed by last General Assembly to visit two of the Synods of the Church, and as there might be some matters of doubtful disputation connected with the subject—and as it was very desirable nothing of that kind should be allowed to come up to-day—a day set apart for engaging in devotional exercises—he thought the committee had acted wisely in not making any reference to the appendix till the matter of deputations was brought more formally before the Assembly. He felt this matter—the revival of

true religion—was one of utmost consequence to the Church, and he believed it had taken place to an extent not known by many ministers and elders and members of the Church. It was a matter that ought to make them very thankful to God, and lead them to pray that everywhere over the Church a blessing might be poured out.

Mr JAMES BALFOUR, W.S., said, that having had some opportunities during the year of visiting different parts of the country otherwise than by special appointment of the Assembly, he should like to say a word or two upon what he had seen ; and he was sure that it would be a subject of deep satisfaction to the Assembly that the work of grace was going on so evidently in a number of districts of the land—perhaps not creating so much excitement as there was five or six years ago, but as real, as deep, and, so far as he could judge, as wide. For example, in the district of Larbert there had been for the last three or four months a great inquiry and a great anxiety manifested, and very markedly by young men and young women, especially young men. While in Larbert a few weeks ago one of the ministers told him he had on his roll about 200 hopefully converted during the present winter. With regard to the instrumentality used in different parts of the country, he quite agreed in the inclination to accept the work of any really hearty judicious men, and to exclude those who would mar the work. He believed the Church was feeling more and more the wisdom of this rule, and that ministers in all parts of the land would tell of the advantage derived from strangers coming among them who came in a right spirit, and the danger that had arisen from strangers coming among them who were not of a right spirit ; and this led them to feel more and more the extreme importance of the superintendence of the minister of the place where the work of revival had begun. Some thought that where other instruments were used, the minister was to be set aside ; but he thought the minister was placed in a far more difficult and important position than he could possibly be otherwise ; and he believed that the history and experience of this movement would show that in places where there had been a revival, where the minister had thrown himself into the work and had shown he sympathised with it, and where he had gone along with the instrumentality put into his hands, guiding and counselling them, the result had been manifestly advantageous ; whereas, if he withdrew from it, and left the work to be carried on by strangers, over whom he had no control, the worst results followed. Therefore he could hardly imagine a minister placed in a more difficult and important position ; and while he agreed that they should use other kinds of instrumentality, he thought they should seek as wisely as they could to use them judiciously in the work set before them.

Mr M'CORKLE, St Ninians, corroborated the account given of the work at Larbert, and said it was remarkable that Larbert and Dunipace were the only places in the district where the revival had been going on. He thought that there the Church was reaping the fruit of the seed sown by Bonar, M'Cheyne, and other devoted pastors of that united parish. The facts which had been stated were encouraging to them in the way of seeking not only an extension of the spiritual awakening throughout their own Church, but a national revival throughout Scotland. It was only by a national revival that they could expect to see that ultimatum which he believed many were longing for—a national reformed Church

—one that would be national not only in name, but as embracing the great body of the people. He moved that the report be approved of, and that the cordial thanks of the Assembly be tendered to the convener.

Dr DAVID BROWN, Aberdeen, seconded the motion, which was agreed to, and the Assembly approved of the Report, reserving consideration of the Appendix till a future diet. The Assembly at the same time recorded their strong sense of Dr Wood's valuable services in the work of this committee, and tendered to him their cordial thanks.

LETTER FROM DR CLASON.

Sir HENRY MONCREIFF said the Moderator had received the following letter from Dr Clason, who was now almost quite recovered from the attack of illness with which he was visited at the first diet of the Assembly :—

“ Rev. Sir,—I have a request, through you, to the venerable the General Assembly of the Free Church, that the Assembly would appoint the Rev. Robert Gordon, my colleague, as my substitute as one of the clerks during the remaining diets of the Assembly.—I have the honour to remain your faithful servant, PATRICK CLASON.” (Applause.)

The request was acceded to.

After renewed devotional exercises, the Assembly adjourned at four o'clock.

EVENING SEDERUNT.

The Assembly met again at seven o'clock. The Rev. Robert Gordon took his seat at the clerk's table, in place of Dr Clason, and his temporary appointment was formally intimated to him by the Moderator.

COMMITTEE ON COMMISSIONS—REFERENCE FROM THE PRESBYTERY OF ABERDEEN.

Sir HENRY W. MONCREIFF gave in the report of the Committee on Commissions, in a few of which slight irregularities had been found, notwithstanding which they were sustained. In connexion with two of them, however, there was some difficulty. It appeared that the certificates to Major Ross, representative from the Presbytery of Alford, and to Mr Neil Smith, representative from the Presbytery of Turriff, did not proceed from the kirk-session of a sanctioned charge, but from that of a preaching station. With respect to these certificates, the Assembly took up the reference from the Presbytery of Aberdeen thereanent, which the Committee on Bills had agreed to transmit. It appeared that the Presbytery had been requested to attest certificates for these elders, according to Act XIII. 1863, but that the Presbytery had found difficulty in the fact that the elders belonged only to an interim session, appointed by the Presbytery. Parties were called, when there appeared to state the reference for the Presbytery of Aberdeen, Principal Lumsden, Dr R. J. Brown, Dr David Brown, and Mr Adam. The General Assembly dismissed the reference, found that the Act XIII. 1863, includes such cases as those of Major Ross and Mr Smith, and appointed the Presbytery of Aberdeen to meet as soon as possible, with instructions to grant *bona fide* certificates to these ruling elders.

REPORT ON CONVERSION OF JEWS.

Mr MOODY STUART, in giving in the report of this committee, (No. VIII.,) said, in the Report on the Conversion of the Jews, which I have the honour of laying on the table of the Assembly, the first station referred to is Amsterdam. That station has been vacant till now, so that there is less to report of present work, but the committee's deputation last year had an opportunity of seeing some of the fruits of the labours of Dr Schwartz. When we read of three or four baptisms in the course of a year, our Christian progress seems extremely slow, but these swell into a goodly number in process of time. When I was at Pesth, nine years ago, I learned there had been one hundred Jews, young and old, baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus. At Amsterdam, Dr Schwartz had baptized about fifty Jews, young and old, in fifteen years. On account of the condition of the Dutch churches, by which each is bound to support its own poor, and to take charge of the orphan children and its poor members, and from our mission congregation not being thus constituted, the converts are scattered as members of various churches in the city, but they assembled together by invitation to the number of thirty-five, and I addressed them shortly through an interpreter. It was an affecting sight to see so many of the children of Abraham professing to be followers of Him whom their fathers crucified; but I shall never forget one young man, about twenty-five years old, who did not speak formally in the name of the rest, but gave utterance for himself and for them to the irrepressible emotions of his heart. His only object seemed to be that of the Samaritan leper, who returned and thanked God with a loud voice for his recovery. I could not but conclude that that young man had found for himself the pearl of great price, and that he still retained the warmth and freshness of his first love. While he pressed my hand in both of his, the burden of his heart's outpouring was, "Thank the friends in Scotland for sending us the gospel of Jesus Christ." Mr Meyer has been appointed to Amsterdam, and was to be introduced to his new charge by Dr Schwartz ten days ago. The committee deeply regret his removal from the interesting district around Ancona; but they had, on the one hand, their important Jewish station at Amsterdam to be supplied, for which they had not found a missionary, and for which he seemed equally fitted; and on the other hand, there was not much Jewish work at Ancona. Many of the Dutch Church, among whom he will be resident, entertain a warm affection for Scotland. The letters of Samuel Rutherford, and the writings of Dr Chalmers, are well known to them, and some of them are deeply interested in the Free Church. Those of high position at the Hague have traced our history with intense interest from the first, and a younger generation have recently learned something from the memoirs of the late Duchess of Gordon. But Strathbogie sometimes puzzles foreigners in a way that would not occur to us. That region from time to time makes itself so known among us that it seems to shine, with little intermission, as a star of the first magnitude in our ecclesiastical firmament. (Laughter.) But, after all, what is Strathbogie? It is neither a kingdom nor a country, nor a large town, and the Dutchmen, not knowing what to make of it, have unhappily ignored its existence altogether. A stranger, indeed, could scarcely enter our Assembly any year without finding tangible proof that

Strathbogie is not yet numbered among the things that were. I found a lady of the court of the Queen of Holland deeply interested in its history, but quite puzzled about its locality, because it had no place in their map. "I wish very much," she said to me, "to know where 'Strathbodjy' is. I have looked for it in the map, and can't find it." (Laughter.) Mr Moody Stuart then gave an account of a visit he had paid to a Jewish burying-ground, over which was placed the inscription, "The house of the living," showing that Abraham's children retained a firm hold of Abraham's faith in the resurrection of the dead. He then described a visit he had paid to a large diamond factory in the Jewish quarter, with all its workmen Jews. The work is so extensive that the diamond trade in connexion with it is said to give subsistence to about 10,000 of the Jews in Amsterdam, and the skill of the workmen is so noted that some of them were sent off to London to polish the Koh-i-noor diamond of our Queen. Their knives are diamond chisels, and as hard emery powder, which polishes the agate and the sapphire, is too soft for their purpose, it gives place to diamond dust. The flint cuts the marble, the diamond cuts the flint, and the diamond alone cuts the diamond. But they showed us, among their treasures, one stone which there is no other stone in the world hard enough to cut, and which therefore lies there useless. The first thought was to plead for one's self to have the heart of stone taken away; the second was to remember that the heart of the Jew is compared not merely to stone, but to the adamant stone, or the diamond described elsewhere as the "adamant harder than flint." "For they made their hearts an adamant stone, lest they should hear the words of the Lord, therefore cometh great wrath from the Lord of hosts." But again, what was this adamant of adamants to look upon—this diamond harder than all the diamonds of the earth? The Lord said to His prophet, "Go, get a potter's earthen bottle, and break the bottle in their sight, and say, So will I break this people as a potter's vessel, because they have forsaken me." That adamant stone is believed to be of exquisite lustre and of immense value if any man could bring forth its hidden beauty. But meanwhile it is so like Jeremiah's broken piece of an earthen bottle that not one man in 50,000 would stoop to pick it up from the street. It is very like the broken stopper of a bottle of coarse green glass, and surely this stone presents a lively image of that people in whose charge it rests. A piece of old broken pottery that cannot be mended, and whose use on this earth is long since passed for ever, is the world's estimate of the Jews, and God himself said that he would make them such in the eyes of men. Yet the same Lord God also charges them with making their hearts adamant; and, changing the image, by the same prophet says, "The Lord their God shall save them, and they shall be as the stones of a crown"—as the polished sapphire or the adamant in a royal diadem. When once it has been fairly seen that the heart of the Jew is too hard for the hand or skill of men, the Lord himself will take up their case, and taking into His own hand, and putting forth His own skill upon this despised fragment of a potter's earthen bottle, He will say, "Thou shalt be called by a new name, which the mouth of the Lord shall name; thou shalt be a crown of glory in the hand of the Lord, and a royal diadem in the hand of thy God." In Breslau, our devoted missionary, Mr Edward, is sometimes apt to be discouraged, and complains of little direct work among the Jews, yet he never fails to impress the Christians to whom he

ministers with his own intense love for Israel ; and in a recent letter he makes the extraordinary statement, from authority on which he could depend, that in the forty years preceding 1853, there had been baptized in Silesia alone 6000 Jews, of whom a large proportion were believed to be under serious impressions of the truth as it is in Jesus. He refers to our devoted female missionary in the town of Gorlitz, and states his belief that she has found access to every Jewish family in the place, from the Rabbi downward, and his hope that her zealous labours will be crowned with a blessing. In regard to his personal labours, I shall just read a few sentences from his letter of last month, relating a visit which he paid to a respectable Jewish family in a village across the Bohemian frontier :—"The colporteur and I arrived about noon, and remained till next morning ; and literally, from the time I entered the house till eleven at night, I was not suffered to be silent five minutes. With L. himself and his daughter I had long and earnest conversation ; the heart of the latter is very tender, but Mrs L. was the person to whom I trust the visit was especially blessed. Our colporteur contemplated her with wonder as she sat listening to the word, and whispered to a neighbour that 'such things as these she had never heard before.' When I touched on the passage, 'they shall look on Him whom they have pierced,' she asked her husband where that was. He took the Hebrew Bible and translated it to her literally from the Hebrew. She was much affected, and would seemingly have sat up all the night. Next morning she said, 'I think the reason why our fathers did not receive Him was that He came as a common man, and not as a prince or in the clouds of heaven.' This led me to explain Isaiah liii. Her husband said, 'It is the truth ; we cannot say a word against it.' She burst into tears, and said, 'To think that we are thus straying and wandering like lost sheep, crying and praying, and not knowing whether we are heard, and the Messiah is *there*.' It was an affecting sight, this Israelitish family thus bowing their hearts before the Redeemer. There is still something to forbid water, till the Holy Ghost come down with His baptism of fire ; but I left with a heart full of thankfulness to God, and hope of a full blessing through the prayers of God's people." With regard to the schools at Pesth, they had this year the interesting fact, hitherto, he supposed, unexampled, of a large number of Jewish parents, not only sending their children to a Christian school, but paying Christian missionaries for giving their children an education in which the New Testament of our Lord Jesus Christ is daily taught, explained, and enforced. No doubt their object was that their children should get on better in the world ; but there must be a wonderful removal of prejudice on the part of parents to induce them to go so far. These boys and girls would leave school with their prejudices against Christianity weakened or removed, or probably turned into prepossession in its favour. Since the Disruption, probably about 2000 altogether had passed through the schools. Now, these children, grown to be men and women, read in their Bibles, or hear in their synagogues, the 22d Psalm, the 53d of Isaiah, or the 12th of Zechariah, and I think I may venture to say that many of them will never all their lives be able to hear the words, "They pierced my hands and my feet," "He was led as a lamb to the slaughter," "They shall look on me whom they have pierced," without awakening the thought of Christ, and Him crucified. (Applause.) The report then referred to the influence brought to bear upon parents

through the verses repeated at home by the children attending the schools at Constantinople, and the hymns they sing. At Prague three proselytes had been baptized during the year—two young Jewish ladies and a young man—who will assist the missionary as a colporteur. There also, year after year, Jewish prejudices are being taken out of the way. The missionaries at Constantinople say that many of the educated young Jews now acknowledge that Jesus of Nazareth was a good man, and that He was ill-treated by their fathers. Mr Moody Stuart then proceeded—The only other subject I shall take up is that of the Hungarian Bohemian bursaries. For them I am sorry we have not half the funds that we require—between L.200 to L.300 a-year. One of the students, now a minister in Bohemia, has translated the Shorter Catechism into the Bohemian or the Czech language. The other is the active centre of evangelistic labours over a wide district of his native country. The first of our Hungarian students is our professor of Church History in their central college of Debrneesin, and who writes in terms of warmest gratitude towards this Church, as indeed they all do. To-night I feel that we are strong in the cause of Israel by the presence of my revered and beloved friend, Dr Cappadose. (Applause.) His name is well known to you all. It is a name long known and honoured in the whole Christian world, and recently brought out more prominently by the active interest he took in the release of Matamoros from a Spanish prison. Dr Cappadose is the lively centre of a devoted and influential circle of Christians at the Hague. He is not indeed the direct fruit of Christian missions to the Jews; but what is still more interesting, he owes his conversion, under God, to the Old Testament Scriptures, and this gives us great encouragement to pray that the veil may be taken off the eyes of Israel when they read Moses and the prophets. The fervour of first love is always refreshing to see; yet we rejoice over it with trembling, because that goodness is sometimes like the morning cloud and the early dew; but there is nothing in the Church either so valuable or so honourable as the leaf remaining green and fruit still coming forth fresh in old age. I lived, fourteen years ago, at Dr Cappadose's house at the Hague, and again last year; and among many honoured Gentile Christians, I have seen nowhere abroad or at home a brighter example both of consistent walk and of the warmth of early love to our Lord Jesus Christ, and to the children of men, than I have found cherished in the house of a Christian Jew.

DR CAPPADOSE (of the Hague, Holland) spoke at some length, and said, Standing before the honourable Assembly, I cannot conceal my deep emotion for the goodness of God that He permitted me, after a lapse of twenty-one years, to enjoy the privilege to return to Scotland, and to be again in this noble Assembly. In the former time the Free Church had but few years; now she has grown up a stout invigorated man; and I in the former time began my address with thanks to God that for the first time in my life I witnessed a really Christian Church enjoying the true liberty, being the entire submission and obedience to the Word of God; and now, reverend fathers, I witness with delight the blessings that the Almighty continually has accorded to you of Christian courage and faith. The Free Church of Scotland stands in the midst of the nineteenth century as a glorious and encouraging witness that the right way of duty is the true way of life and prosperity. And now I hope the

honourable Assembly will, with great forbearance and indulgence, hear her brother of the Continent, having but a very small knowledge of your beautiful language ; but bearing on your patience, I have accepted with thankfulness the kind and honourable invitation to come into this House to plead the cause of my old people. Twenty years ago, when I returned home from Scotland, I felt myself compelled to gather together some friends, and search the good for the house of Israel. Now, you must know that we have in Holland more than 60,000 Jews, and Amsterdam alone contains 30,000. They are extremely clinging one to another, and very inaccessible. I raised a Society of Friends of Israel, still existing, and developed by the coming of Dr Schwartz at Amsterdam, several years after my first endeavours. We in the Hague have had in the beginning several missionaries, but experience proved that these had very seldom an opportunity to be in personal intercourse with the Jews on account of their inaccessibility. I saw the necessity of going on by another way. In my prayer meetings I try more to be useful to my Christian friends in setting before them the dealings of God with His old people. I try to make them know their firm and hopeful prospects in giving simply explanations of the prophecies, and explain the best means to speak with the Jews. In so doing, I interested more the Christian in the holy sake of Jesus, showing that it is a very duty of every Christian man to promote, in the midst of the many Israelites, the true knowledge of the way of salvation. So doing, I awoke love for Israel in the hearts of my hearers ; and many a workman in his own way became a very good evangelist to the Jews. You see this is an indirect but still powerful manner to bring the glad tidings of the Gospel to the followers of the law. It is in my eye needful to follow this way. I remember former days in my youth, when a missionary of one or other Society of Friends of Israel came to our house in his official character, I was strong against him ; and the very idea that the object that this man came to me was to bring me to Christendom, armed me with the decided thought to resist him ; but when an ordinary Christian, not an official man, spoke to me on Christendom, well, then, I listened to him. Your mission at Amsterdam extended, by the zealous efforts of brother Dr Schwartz in a remarkable way, the labours I proposed in this field. We have worked together in the same spirit, however with some difference in the manner of working. He has worked by means of two well-fitted Christian missionaries—I by the instrumentality of many workmen not regularly and officially adapted to this work of evangelisation. But, coming to my prayer-meetings, many workmen obtained a good knowledge of the principal historical parts of the Old Testament, and they are well prepared to show forth to their Jewish fellow-workmen the arguments to prove the fulfilment of the prophecies in the blessed Lord and true Messiah. Thus has been many sinners blessed by them. Once it happened between a mason and his Jewish assistant. Well, he was listening to his friend, began to search his own heart, and, having no rest or peace there, he desired almost to have a true knowledge of the Gospel. He came then to me with his wife. I told him to learn to read ; and he came regularly three times a week to me to receive instruction in the Word of God. His heart having been opened by the Spirit of God, he received gladly the good tidings, and enjoys at present the true peace that surpasseth all understanding. He is baptized since

with his wife, and proves the truth of his confession by his consistent conduct. So it happened in another case also, by a workman accustomed to frequent my meetings, and well instructed by this regular means in the knowledge of the fulfilled prophecies. He was even as the former, a warm friend of Israel, and spoke often with a good Jew workman, being with him every day occupied in the same business. But this Jew was a more rigid one, much attached to his own religion; but he also listened with earnestness to his Christian friend. He became ill; and, after two days, the case was hopeless. In the utmost anxiety of his soul, he cried out for his Christian friend; he must come. He came, and the poor sufferer, in fearful position of mind, desired, in the great emotion of his heart in this solemn moment, that his Christian friend might pour out a hearty supplication to the Almighty God in order to give peace to his extremely agitated soul. But his Christian friend said to him: "You know, my good friend, I cannot pray to the Holy God but in the name of the Redeemer, my blessed Lord Jesus, the true Messiah: do you desire that?" "Pray, O pray," was the answer. Well, he prayed a most faithful and fervent prayer for this poor Jew, that the Lord would have mercy upon him, and forgive all his sins, by the precious blood of Jesus Christ; and when finished, the dying man took the two hands of his Christian friend, crying out with a loud voice, "Amen, Amen." Half an hour after that, he died. This happened in the presence of his family and several Jews. Well, we may entertain a very good hope of such a deathbed. But not in all cases the efforts we do are so blessed. The last time I myself met with a good learned Jew, he was very friendly, and we had a good conversation. I asked him if he knew what happened with our forefathers when in their tents with the fiery serpents that bit the people. "O yes, sir," was his answer; "Moses was commanded by God to make a serpent of brass, and put it on a pole, so that every one coming out and looking upon the serpent remained in life. I know," he said further, "that you apply this to your Christ, but that is a great mistake: the intention of God was alone that they ought to look on high to the help of God." "How is it possible," I replied, "that thou, a man of good understanding, givest such an explanation? If that was true, for what reason should the Lord have commanded that they should come out and look upon the elevated serpent? Remaining in their tents they could look towards God." Well, then, I saw in his fearful countenance that the light of truth came to him, but that he rebuked it voluntarily. In general, we can perceive that circumstances we have to deplore in our Church in the Netherlands are indeed not favourable seasons for the conversion of the Jews. Many years ago, several clergymen began the declension in faith by separating the Old Testament from the New. The Old was set aside; and I venture to say that this is the cause of our desolate state. They may not be separated one from another; both together formed one living Word of God. I remember the judgment of the wise King Solomon when the two mothers came to him as the judge, with a living and a dead child: the one says, The living one is mine; no, says the other, He is mine. The king commanded the living must be cut in two, and each mother could have the half. The true mother's heart could not insist, and cried out, "Give the living to her." Well, so it is with the Word of God. Old and New Testament is one living book of God; and from the very time

that the Christian Church forgot that she is established on Israelitish ground, she was near her decay. Nevertheless, it remains true, indeed, that love for Israel is the best means to gain them for Christ. I will prove that by history. When we study the history of the Christian Church in relation to Israel's conversion, then we find that there is a constant relation between the measure of development of the Christian's life of faith and the manifestation of faithfulness in the Christian Church, and between the accession of Israelites to the gospel. Out of this view we are enabled to divide the whole history of the Church, after the apostolic age, in synchronic order, with the history of the Jews in behalf of their conversion, in three epochs. In the first ages of the apostles and apostolical men, every year, by the flourishing state of the Church in doctrine, and conduct of the Christians, by the warm love for Israel, and by her continual extension, thousand and thousand conversions of Jews engraft the number of church members. Just at this time, the first charity being not yet declining, the zeal not yet diminished, a great number of Israelites came to the acknowledgment of the true Messiah. Even so remarkable it was, in the second place, how, in the long series of years in which the universal hardening of the heart and enmity against Christians was observed amongst the Jews, just in this period the gradual degeneration and decay of the Christian Church took place: so that, instead of the prayer for Israel, the threatenings; instead of the sword of the spoiler, which is the Word of God, the murderer's sword; instead of the fire of charity, the fire of brand-stapels seemed to be taken as the most convenient means of bringing the Jews to the acceptance of the Christian faith. In the third place, both the history of the Jews and of the Christian Church instruct us that from the very time that charity and prayer for Israel were anew exercised in a great deal by the Christian Church in different lands, a greater opening for the acceptance of the evangelical truth took place on the side of Israel. He that is no stranger in history agrees certainly with me, that in a Church wherein the service of a Three-one God was united with the service of images and divination of man, and where the so-called "chevaliers of the cross" have opened themselves a way to the grave of the King of the Jews by streams of Jewish blood; in such a time the season for the Jew to learn a true knowledge of the spirit of Christendom was not a favourable one. On the contrary, I venture to say that, by such horrible fruits of a so-called Christian zeal, the heart of the Jew must undoubtedly have been hardened in his unbelief. These threefold observations fix our attention, not alone on the very source of the lamented deadness which covered the heart of Israel during centuries, but opened in the same time, for the future, a most cheerful prospect; yea, tends powerfully to encourage us to go forth stretching out our hands with the spiritual armour of continual prayer, of unwearied love, in connexion with the Biblical instruction to the swerving Jew—such was the doing of Jesus, such of the Apostles. With what great a blessing the Apostle Paul, whose immediate calling was to be an Apostle of the Gentiles, has also laboured under Israel; but he does not use other means than a weary heart of love and true instruction in the prophetic writings, and these means have been greatly blessed by the Lord. The apostolic man of the second and third century manifested the same sympathy for the guilty, and therefore utterly pitiful, people of the Jews; and how many hundred of those have

joined themselves to the young church of these times. I need not remind you, brethren, of Justin the Martyr, whose charitable zeal, devotedness, impartial and true explication of the prophets, are known by his excellent "Dialogus cum Judae Triphone," containing so good a provision of heavenly wisdom, explaining the Scriptures, not as the Christian Church has done, century after century, in a manner as unsound as inequitable, applying all the threatenings and judgments in a literal sense to the Jewish nation, but even so, for the old promises of blessing returns and future glory and spirituality to the Christian Church. With an utmost remarkably exactness and clearness he commented on the fulfilled, not alone, but also the unfulfilled prophecies of the Messiah in his humiliation, and in his exaltation and glory; the time of Israel's rejection, and also of her restoration. After the first four centuries, when the despotic power of the clergy was increasing, and the decay of Church doctrine deepened, man began to forget that the whole tree of Christendom was grafted into the Israelitish stem; the Israelites were more exclusively regarded as concerning the gospel enemies, forgetting that they are also beloved as touching the election. Even they who in this matter seem to make an exception, were still far of the desire to bring the love-creating gospel, in its reconciling character, in contact with the poor children of Abraham. I can therefore not say much of the efforts of Sencrus, bishop of Minorca, who, in the fifth century endeavoured to preach the Gospel to the Jews; or of the Pope Silvester, and the Bishop Leona on the isle of Chypore—but I like to remember how the pious Bishop of Poitiers has been enabled, by his warm love, to bring a great number of Israelites to Christ their Saviour alone, by his meekness and charitable conduct, and most ardent prayers for their salvation. Especially I ought to make mention of the zealous Isidorus, whose efforts in the first council of Toledo, made a deep impression upon all the assistants, so that they became convinced of the unjust and perverse means of constraint and violence in order to convert the Jews. From time to time some arose under the high clergy, pitying the state of the Israelites, and using the means of love and tender compassion amongst the people, in order that they may learn the spirit of Christendom—such was Julianus, the Bishop of Toledo, in the seventh century; the excellent Rabbi Mons, better known by his new name, Don Pedro Alfonso, celebrated for his piety and science, and baptized under the god-fathership of the King of Arragon, in the 12th century, at Hucsea. This zealous man has been, by the grace of God, a powerful instrument to convince many Israelites of the gospel truths. But all these good men were exceptions, as glittering stars in a dark night. I may not forget the great Rabbi Tomah of Murcia, or Dr Hieronymus of Santa Fé, or Solomon Levi, one of the most learned and pious men, well known under the name of Panlus de Burgos, patriarch of Aquitania, who endeavours to show the fulfilment of the prophecies in the dear person of our Lord, have been a blessing for several Jews. But, I repeat, these are exceptions. The Church, lying down in darkness and idolatry, and continually armed with the sword of persecution, has indeed not the power of bringing the Israelites from Moses to Christ and his Gospel. This being the truth, the Christian, instead of wondering himself about the long-protracted hard-heartedness of the Jews, has more reason to humble himself in sackcloth and ashes and confess; yea, lament her guilt towards that

people because she has done more for the nourishment of their hatred feelings on Christendom, than to attract them to Christ by love. How many centuries went on ere the Jew could give another answer to the demand, What think you of Christendom? than this, it is a service of images, and it manifests its power by the bloody sword and terrible persecution of its people. The Christian Church, in the middle age, has plainly forgot the touching words of the dying Saviour—"Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do." The Christian Church, planting in every place the cross, with the image of the crucified King of the Jews, forgot the tears in His blessed eyes that He once wept over the guilty Jerusalem; instead of these, every one bearing his name ought to learn, by His example, that meekness, love, commiseration, and softness in our conversation with the Israelites are truly the best, the godliest way to promote their conversion. At last, after that long and dark night of the middle ages, the first morning beam of a new day illuminated the horizon of the Church. The Lord spake again, "Let there be light, and there was light." The Reformation begins. The God-man, the Elias of this time, arose. As after a long winter all around shows a renewed life, the doctrine of salvation, so long time oppressed, but imperishable, came out with new clearness, and the banner of the cross, moved by the breath of God, displayed itself anew gloriously, in order to let it be known to the sinners of all people, nations, and tribes, that there is a redemption in the blood of the Lamb that takes away the sin of the world. For anew, as in the apostolic times, the fountain was opened for the thirsty; for anew the aspirations of so many people ascend to the throne of the Almighty with joyful thanks for the blessings and the new life bestowed upon the Church. But alas for the poor sons of the friend of God, for the swerving, exiled out of the inheritance of their fathers. However, the sword was now silent, and the great persecution and oppression have ceased. Still the day-spring gave not a cheering warmth. No, the rising sun was colouring and illuminating the tops of the mountains, and Israel dwelt in the valley. But there also the clouds of prejudice and uncharitableness will be dissipated by the light of the gospel, and open a fresh and lively way for the nations of sorrow. And now I will come to a better season for Israel. I must make some mention of the zeal and activity of the pious Franken and Callenberg, who have been the instruments, in the hand of God, to bring so many Israelites to believe in Christ, and formed so many evangelists and missionaries, who spread the gospel seed over the whole earth. Especially I remember the energetic labours of Schulr, by whom, in his constant and charitable efforts, the resistance of so many Israelites has been broken and overpowered by the victorious force of the resurrected Saviour. This unwearied man was standing upon the rock of the divine promises for the readoption of the seed of Abraham, and was going on his way hopeful and joyous. And now the sun is rising. As I look on the last century, upon the vast extension and great work of the English Society for Promoting the Gospel among the Jews, I thank God for that blessed day, thirty years ago, when, in your General Assembly, my honoured, now unspeakably happy friend, Wodrow, a man of prayer, and devoted friend of the old people, because he was a warm friend of the King of Israel, rose in order to plead for the sake of Israel and the whole Christian world; yea, so many souls of the children of Abraham

are perfectly aware of the unparalleled blessings the Lord himself has showered upon your efforts for the salvation of Israel ; and it is a happy duty for my heart to give openly, before my mouth will be silent for ever, my warmest thanks for your consistent love for my brethren in the flesh. The conclusion of all that is said is the following :—A comparative examination of the state of the Christian Church, and the conversion of Israel, instructed me that in every period of a flourishing state of the Church, abounding in love, the number of the conversions of the Jews in different places have been increasing, so that I venture to say that a life of faith in the Church, love for Israel, and blessings from above on the Church of Christ and on the people of Israel, for His salvation, are three utterly indispensable things. Now let me, by some examples, lay before you the evidence how love for Israel will always be blessed by the Lord. The good man Schur witnessed once in Despau a striking proof of this. A very lively young student Israelite came to a dressmaker, in order to get a new dress for himself. This workman was a very humble and pious Christian, and he loved much the children of Abraham. Being occupied in taking the measure, he felt so deep an emotion at the thought of the lamentable state of mind of the young Israelite, that he could not keep his tears. “What is the matter?” asked the student. Then he explained, with great simplicity, but with a trembling voice, the feeling of his heart. “Well, what is that to you?” replied the Israelite. “You have nothing to do with my religion, and I am satisfied when you make me a good fashionable cloak.” “Oh, my dear sir,” the workman replied, “may God, in His mercy, give you the privilege once to read the New Testament. I entertain the hope that it will be for your good.” The Israelite soon left the place, but he could never forget the tears in the eyes of this simple man, the trembling voice, and lovingkindness in his words to him. Continually they were present to his mind, and he fought a long time against them ; but at last he took the resolution to read the gospel. He began to do so in secret. From time to time he cast away the holy book, but after one or two days the renewed remembrance of this Christian weeping over his salvation gave him anew the desire to take up the book and read it. More and more attracted to search after the truth, he found it, by the powerful working of the Spirit of God. Then he made rapid progress, and was accepted, one year after, by baptism, into the Church of Christ, and has made, after two years, a translation in Hebrew of St Luke, which has been spread over the whole of Poland, and has come into the hands of many Jews. Then history reminds me of a well known missionary from the Gentiles. He told me that if his age was not so advanced, he should have a great desire to become a missionary to the Jews ; and on my demanding by what means he should undertake this work, he said, “I should take my place at the door of the synagogue, and weep.” Indeed, a tear of love and pity speaks loudly to the heart of a child of Abraham ; so as it is written, “Thou shalt arise, and have mercy upon Zion : for the time to favour her, yea, the set time, is come. For thy servants take pleasure in her stones, and favour the dust thereof,” (Ps. cii. 13, 14.) May we not forget that if, by the mighty word of the Prince of Love, the dead Lazarus rose, the tears of the Redeemer have prepared the way ! Yes, I venture to say that when the Christian, in his closet, has tears of commiseration for the Jews, then the very time will

be then that we shall hear a noise and a shaking among the dry bones in the valley, and Israel, as Lazarus, will rise, and come out of her grave. This proof of what charity can do happened in Germany. I desire to give you a second proof, which took place in the north of England many years ago. A faithful and zealous clergyman, coming to a new curacy, and discovering that there were plenty of Jews, took the resolution to begin meetings for the Jews, in which he tried to expound all that Moses and the prophets have spoken of the Messiah. He invited a great many Jews to come to the meeting. The church was crowded. He began by saying that after the explication done by himself, he was prepared to give plain liberty to every one to make the remarks he would, so that every Jew also could freely come up and place before the assembly the arguments against the statements of the minister. After an hour, a young rabbi, well known by his talents and science, rose. The minister let him take a seat near him, on the platform. It was a solemn moment. Nearly the whole number of Israelites of the town were assembled. The rabbi began in a very honest manner to propose his arguments; but it was not difficult to the Christian clergyman to refute all the arguments of the Jewish rabbi. He proposed one after another, beginning in a very calm frame of mind; but when he saw himself overruled by the words of the minister, he began to be very agitated. At last, seeing that all his arguments fell down, and feeling that, before the whole congregation, he was losing his reputation as a man of science, he became so angry that, not possessing himself, he gave such a stroke to the minister that he fell down before the pulpit. The minister rising, asked the rabbi, with great calmness, that if he desired to propose other arguments, he was prepared to treat him with the same love. But the rabbi, overpowered by this meekness and charity, descended from the platform and left the church. Two years after this terrible scene, the clergyman being in retirement on the Sabbath day, and having given the order not to come and trouble him, the bell rings. The servant seeing that it was a Jew, and well knowing the love of her master for the Jews, took the liberty of breaking the law, and knocked at the door of the minister's study, saying that a Jew was there. He let him come up. The Jew, in an extreme agitation of mind, asked the minister if he did not recollect him; and that was not easy, because the man was worn out by the many fast-days and the ardent struggles he had had. He was the rabbi, and he told to the minister, that after the witnessing of the unparalleled calmness of announcement of his own, manifested in the person of the clergyman, he, the rabbi, had been deeply shocked in his heart, and had evidently prayed to God that He would answer him—how it could be that a false religion gave such fruit? By the loving conduct of the minister, by his love, charity, and self-denying calmness, he has been plainly attracted to search with the greatest earnestness the truth, and having found this in the gospel, he came to the minister, praying him to prepare him for baptism. Afterwards, he became a tender and humble child of God. Thus you see, my friends, the great power of the Christian law; yea, far more than all the most striking arguments, the good fruits of the good trees come to the heart; and, indeed, Christian love and charity are the best missionaries we could find for the lost sheep of the house of Israel. One proof more, and I stop. Ten years ago, a gentleman asked for me. I came down stairs,

and I saw on his countenance that he was a Jew. He told me that his heart was full of thanks to the Lord, because He is a hearer of our prayers. He had prayed that he might once see my face and press my hand. Three years ago he was in New York, as a tradesman, and passing from one village to another, it happened in his way that he saw on a little hill a gentleman lying with his back against a great tree, absorbed plainly in the perusal of a book that he had in his hand, so that he overlooked him passing that way. The curiosity to know what may be this, gave him the resolution to climb the hill very silently, and looking over the shoulders of the reader, his movement awoke his attention. I made my excuse, and was resolved to relieve him. No, my friend, he says, acknowledging that I was a Jew, come here, sit down, it is here beautiful scenery, and I will show you the book I read. He began to speak to the Jew with great love and tenderness, and then proposed to him to listen to two or three pages of his book. Now this was the little book of the dealings of God with myself, that I published nearly forty years ago. The Jew began to be angry. It is all false, he said, and could I have a copy of this, I am well prepared to write a refutation of this pamphlet. Well, says the Christian friend, I will give you my copy, read it with earnestness, and write against it what you will; but give me the promise not to read, not to write, without imploring the help of God, that He may guide you. Well, this gentleman began in a very bad frame of mind, well resolved to publish a refutation. But the Lord had other things upon him. The more he read, the more he became convinced of the truth, and after some months of heavy struggles, he joined himself as a faithful member to the Christian Church. Therefore he had so great a desire to see my face and grasp my hand. It is not needed to say, that after this most moving story I had no words to speak, but we both knelt down before our Lord and Saviour, the true Messiah, the light of the nations and the glory of Israel. May, then, after all this the conviction be deepened in your hearts, and the hearts of all children of God, that love, love to the Jews, and the warm prayers for their salvation, will certainly be heard by our blessed Lord, the life of our life, and on His blessed return, the promise will certainly be fulfilled, that all Israel will be saved. The land waits on the people; the people wait on their king, and the king upon the due time. But I may no longer abuse your patience, I finish in the expression of my heart, that the Free Church of Scotland may be more and more humbled under the blessings so peculiarly bestowed by God upon her; and as she is a blessing for so many churches on the Continent, she also may be, in the hand of God, an extended blessing to the children of Jacob.

MR ADAM, Aberdeen, moved the adoption of the following deliverance:—“That the General Assembly approve of the report, and return their thanks to the committee. They express their gratitude to the God of Israel for the continued and growing success of the schools for the children of Jews in Pesth and Constantinople, and for the progress of the work at other stations. They desire to commend Mr Meyer to the head of the Church in his new sphere at Amsterdam, and the other missionaries and agents in their respective stations. They rejoice also in the important, varied, and enlarging field that is opened among the Gentiles through the mission to the Jews, especially in Hungary, and they commend the Hungarian and Bohemian bursaries to the liberality of the

Church. Further, they cordially welcome Dr Cappadose, whom they are glad to see again in the midst of them, and to hear pleading the cause of his brethren, the children of Israel, in this Assembly." Mr Adam, in supporting the resolution, remarked upon the propriety with which this report had been placed first in their programme of ordinary business, as it marked their conviction that this was the primary duty of the Church of Christ, and accorded with our Lord's instruction to His disciples to "preach repentance and remission of sins among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem." He was afraid—looking at the falling off in the collection, and at other circumstances—that there was not now the same strong and warm interest in the cause that existed at a former period. Perhaps this might in some degree be traced to the want of large success; yet, had time permitted, he thought he could have shown that the very blindness of mind and hardness of heart on the part of God's ancient people ought, in certain aspects, to have a favourable influence,—that it was really fitted to strengthen faith, and act not as a hindrance, but rather as a stimulus. But, at the same time, were all things taken into account, there was no quarter where a larger blessing had been given. Not a few of the brightest ornaments of the Christian Church in recent years, and not a few of the noblest defenders of the Christian faith had been drawn from the ranks of Israel. It was true the report did not contain any striking cases of conversion, but preparations were made, and operations were in progress, which they could not but suppose, without yielding to unbelief, would end in very important issues. In Hungary their operations had been recommenced with blessed results. They could not forget that Hungary had, after a long struggle, regained her liberty; and while they were not politicians here, he trusted the heart of the Free Church would always beat in sympathy with the cause of human freedom and progress; and he trusted that they who had for so long a time patiently and courageously contended for their rights, would not be indifferent to the higher privileges of religion, and to the sacred and inviolable rights of conscience. (Applause.) It was encouraging to know that at Pesth there was a school with nearly 500 children in attendance, three-fourths of whom were Jews, and that there was a congregation of 400, with 150 independent contributors at the rate of 16s. 8d. each for the support of ordinances. In the Free Church he believed a proposal was to be made in regard to the Sustentation Fund, that congregations averaging 10s. each member should receive certain advantages over those who gave at a lower rate; and he thought that was not a high rate to aim at, when they found these poor Hungarians contributing 16s. 8d. each to support ordinances among themselves. In conclusion, he thought they might well wish for this great event—the conversion of the Jews—for the sake of the Christian Church. They should remember that the Israelites were still beloved of God, and they should also remember that the destinies of the Jews and of themselves were marvellously bound up together. Their return would be like "life from the dead" to the rest of the world; so that, in so far as they desired to see the fulness of the Gentiles, they must pray and labour for the ingathering of the Jews. (Applause.)

Professor DUNCAN seconded the motion. After some introductory remarks, he said—Returning from Italy to Pesth, I was cheered by learning from the *Witness* that the first thing our Church had done after

its exodus was to take up heartily the mission to the Jews. Continuing with the same, or rather with increased zeal, to pray and labour for "the peace of Jerusalem," we have sure ground for anticipating in the future what we have so largely experienced hitherto—the fulfilment of the promise, "They shall prosper that love thee." I hope we shall never be forgetful of the admonition—"Thou bearest not the root, but the root thee." Long did ancient Israel pray for us, though for the time being it was hedged in as "a garden enclosed," a conservatory of God's truth and the world's hope, rather than a missionary Church for its diffusion; ardently did they pray, binding, as Jehovah's promise to Abraham had done, their own blessing and ours together—"Lord be merciful to us and bless us, and cause thy face to shine upon us; that thy way may be known upon earth—thy saving health among all nations." Long had they to wait for our calling; longer than we have had for their recall. But the vision was "for an appointed time;" at the end it spoke and did not lie. So let us not be weary in this well-doing, for the Lord, who hath spoken good concerning Israel in their latter end, is not slack concerning His promise, as some men—too many in the present day—count slackness. Though it tarry let us wait for it, because it will surely come, it will not tarry. Sailing from Dover to Ostend, on my way first to Pesth, we found a Jewish family on board, of which fact I became aware by seeing on their carriage the motto, "Fuimus, erimus." There was no "sumus." Israel hath indeed a present, though a most lamentable one; but what a glorious past, what a still more glorious future! The heart turned to the Lord, the veil taken away, the blind eyes opened, the steadfast look to the end of that which was to be abolished, (even Messiah, the end of the law for righteousness;) the deaf ear unstopped to hear the heart-melting, "Father, forgive them." Ah! we knew not; now we know what we have done; but the answer to the request of the despised and rejected One hath been waiting for us during the long centuries, stored up among Jehovah's treasures. And now it hath come—it hath come to abide for ever. For Israel hath not been forsaken, nor Judah of his God, of the Lord of hosts; though their land was filled with sin against the Holy One of Israel. Oh, the bitter weeping—the burning blush of shame—the tender kiss of reconciliation—the jubilant anthems of the long-estranged now in everlasting loving-kindness reclaimed, never more to part! And this *redintegratio amoris* will tell most blessedly upon us; it will be as life from the dead. We are living in times of much unsettlement and commotion, and many things seem to portend that the end is fast approaching. Faith both in the true and the false seems rapidly giving way. The gigantic idolatry of India appears to be undermined and ready to fall some day with a sudden crash; the moon of Islām is rapidly decreescent; destruction is impending on the seven hills; and Satan, seeing that his old lies of false and superstitious belief are verging to decrepitude, seems bent on involving the truth along with them in one common ruin—sowing fast the seeds of uncertainty and apostasy among those who have been favoured with the light of the Bible reopened and outspread at the glorious Reformation. That Bible is assailed chiefly, at least the attack is first commenced on the Old Testament Scriptures—the common ground of Jew and Christian, and of which the Jew is at once the custodian, and one main proof of their truth as well as that of the New. Moses hath still

in many a city them that preach him, being read in the synagogues every Sabbath day; and though the Spirit has withdrawn, (heavy woe is that,) yet there the Word remains—a keepsake, a memento of the love and espousals still remembered by Him whose gifts and callings are without repentance. When treacherous Judah had provoked, a prophet was sent to recall backsliding Israel—when the seed of Jacob had obstinately done despite to the Holy Ghost, speaking by the apostles whom the risen Messiah had sent to bless them in turning every one of them from their iniquities, Lo, said they, we turn to the Gentiles; and do not both indications of Scripture and the signs of the times lead us to think that a new epoch is approaching, when a great Gentile apostasy shall be accompanied or followed by the recall of Israel to Jehovah their God and David their king. Wondrous, without doubt, will be the results of that event; looking forward to which, and combining it with the equally wonderful event of his own day, namely, the calling of the Gentiles, the apostle exclaims, “Oh, the depth both of the wisdom and knowledge of God!” Long and dismal hath been the night of weeping to the desolate one—the wife of youth—when she was refused; but bright shall the time be when the light of the moon shall be as the light of the sun, and the light of the sun shall be sevenfold, as the light of seven days, in the day that Jehovah bindeth up the breach of His people, and healeth the stroke of their wound. Then they that *will* not see *shall* see and be ashamed. Dark days, I fear, are to intervene, but the time cannot now be far away when Jehovah will entirely abolish the idols, remove the false prophet, destroy the Man of Sin, bring back the outcasts of Judah and the preserved of Israel, and take all nations for His inheritance. Then shall all Israel be saved, and the people be all righteous; they shall inherit the land for ever, the branch of Jehovah’s planting, the work of His hand, that He may be glorified. Meanwhile there is of them a remnant according to the election of grace, as there has been in every age, and in the present more than in any that has preceded it. No inconsiderable number are in the Christian ministry, either as missionaries, pastors of congregations, or professors in universities. Of the last we have a noble specimen in Dr Franz Delitzsch, who, as a Christian Jew, stood firm in maintenance of the divine authority and inspiration of the whole Old Testament at a time when many called *gläubige* (believing) seemed willing to surrender, if they could only make terms to escape with the New. Many such Israelites, indeed, I anticipate, will yet arise, the success of whose efforts for the defence and exposition of Holy Scripture will be greatly promoted by their intimate acquaintance with the Hebrew Bible from earliest infancy, and the dispersion of their doubts and difficulties by the light of the Holy Spirit irradiating their minds to perceive with surprise, wonder, and delight the glorious harmony of completed Scripture, with its treasures of things old and new. Yes! as they have been a proverb and a reviling, so shall the children of Israel yet be a blessing in the midst of many lands, and they shall arise a very great army. I may be allowed, to the praise of God’s grace, and for the encouragement of any who may be disposed to give themselves to the work of the Lord in this department of His vineyard, to mention with gratitude that the short period which I spent at Pesth was among the happiest times in my life—perhaps I should say was the very happiest; certainly it was that in

which I most evidently saw the hand of the Lord with us and around us. Circumstances varying from day to day, it looked often as if the Epistles, especially those of Paul, had just arrived by the post, so very apposite were they. Doubts, difficulties, and fears we had in plenty, but we were compassed about with songs of deliverance, and the love of the labourers to one another, of us to the little flock, and of them to us and to one another—a love of which the faith of Jesus was the bond—was to us all a source of constant delight, and made our little meeting a reflection on a small scale of the harmony of the Primitive Church. Permit me, in a sentence or two, to advert to the happy result of our Jewish Mission, in bringing us into more intimate relations to foreign Protestant Churches, especially in Hungary and Bohemia. May these relations continue and become more close. In seeking the Jew, we found *them*. He is the vinculum of our union. In all the young men they have sent us, we have had great satisfaction and anticipate great good, by the divine blessing, as likely to accrue from this bursary scheme. I regret exceedingly to hear that the funds of these bursaries have not been realised this year, but I still hope that not only will they be continued, but that means will be taken to set them on a permanent footing. Oh that the salvation of Israel were come out of Zion! When the Lord brought back the captivity of His people, Jacob shall rejoice and Israel shall sing. Rejoice, ye Gentiles, with His people, for

“He, mindful of His grace and truth,
To Israel’s house hath been;
And the salvation of our God
All ends of the earth have seen.”

(Applause.)

Mr A. N. SOMERVILLE said he had been requested to make a short statement in connexion with the Jewish Mission respecting Hungary, but he felt at that late hour of the evening, and in so thin a house, he would do the cause no good by occupying their attention, and therefore his remarks must be delayed till a future opportunity.

Dr CANDLISH said—I cannot allow this subject to pass without expressing the extreme pleasure with which I have heard Dr Cappadose. It is, I believe, more than twenty years since he addressed our committee on the floor of this House, and I can remember his address. I listened to him to-night with extreme interest, although from growing infirmities I did not hear him so distinctly as I could have wished. But I take the opportunity of saying that I feel deeply indebted to Dr Cappadose for the statement he made to-night as regards the relation of the New Testament to the Old. (Applause.) I think the statement he made on that subject was exceedingly valuable and exceedingly seasonable—(hear, hear)—as showing that the root, the ground of the whole of our gospel, is to be found in the Old Testament, and that we have no standing at all in the New Testament apart from the Old. Such a statement, given forth by a man thoroughly competent to form a judgment upon the subject, is most valuable, and I heartily express my great gratification at again meeting Dr Cappadose, after an interval of more than twenty years, on the floor of the Assembly.

The motion was unanimously agreed to, and the Assembly adjourned.

SATURDAY, MAY 25.

WIDOWS' AND ORPHANS' FUND.

Mr ROBERT GORDON, in the absence of Dr Clason, gave in the report of the Committee on the Widows' and Orphans' Fund, (No. XXXI.)

CASE OF KILMUIR.

The Assembly took up consideration of a petition on behalf of the Free Church congregation of Kilmuir and Stencholl, Isle of Skye. Through the exertions of the late Dr Martin, an elder in the congregation, a church and a manse were built at a cost of £1765; and three years ago, an ordained minister was settled as pastor of the congregation. To meet the expenses of the erection, subscriptions were obtained in Kilmuir and elsewhere to the amount of £543, 3s. 3d., and grants were received from the Assembly's Church and Manse Building Fund, to the extent of £297, 8s. 6d., making in all £840, 11s. 9d. The buildings were proceeded with and finished after the above sum was secured, but still £925 more were necessary to pay the tradesmen's bills for work done. In this emergency, £700 were borrowed from the North of Scotland Bank, and Dr Martin paid the remaining £225 as a loan to the congregation, and to be by them repaid to him. Several names were originally at the bond, which gave a security to the bank for the £700, Dr Martin's among the rest; but it turns out that now his is the only name to which the bank looks for payment. Dr Martin died two years ago, and his widow and family are now pressed with these two heavy liabilities—first, the bank bond, which, with accumulated interest, &c., amounts to £821, 16s. 11d.; and second, the personal loan of £236, 1s. 9d., which, when put together, amount to £1057, 18s. 8d. These pecuniary responsibilities the widow and family of Dr Martin are quite unable to meet; nor can the people of Kilmuir, from their well-known great poverty, remove the obligation. Had Dr Martin's life been spared, his own energy might have extricated matters from their present painful position; but it now seems hopeless, after various trials have been made, to expect any relief, unless the friends of the Church come forward with help generously and speedily rendered. An appeal having been made to the Presbytery, they agreed to petition the Assembly.

Dr MACINTOSH MACKAY, Harris, supported the petition.

Dr CANDLISH said the case was a most distressing one, not only to the congregation, but to the family of the late Dr Martin. The report did not contain a request for a grant from any particular fund, and he did not know whether there was a fund from which such a grant could be made. But the Presbytery seemed to contemplate that the Assembly should interpose a very strong recommendation of this case to the liberality of the more generous and wealthy members of the Church. Considering the circumstances of the congregation, he thought they were entitled to the warmest sympathy of the Assembly, and to all the help the influence of the Assembly could give in stirring up the minds of their liberal and able members to come forward and help them. He therefore moved as follows:—"The General Assembly, having considered the petition from the Presbytery of Skye and Uist, in reference to Kilmuir, and the statement of facts accompanying said petition, regard it as a case

peculiarly deserving the prompt and liberal aid of members of the Church, in order to deliver the parties responsible for an onerous debt which, in their altered circumstances, they are not able to discharge, earnestly recommend the case to the support of those who may be able to give effective aid ; and trust that parties connected with the congregation, who may appeal personally for such aid, will meet with due encouragement. The Assembly also hope that the appeal will be vigorously and speedily prosecuted." He would add that it was extremely important that the recommendation should be instantly and vigorously followed up by the Presbytery and congregation.

Dr GIBSON seconded the motion, and said this case deserved the strongest recommendation of the Assembly.

Dr M'LAUHLAN stated that one of the members of the congregation was at present in Edinburgh, and would receive any contributions that might be made towards this object. From a generous friend he had received £20, and would be glad to take as much more as they liked to give.

The motion was cordially agreed to.

CASE OF INNELLAN.

The Assembly took up the case of the reference from the Presbytery of Dunoon and Inverary, respecting the election of a minister by the congregation at Innellan. This case arose out of the proceedings in connection with the election of a minister to supply the vacancy occasioned by the resignation of the Rev. J. J. Muir. A congregational committee reported a list of five candidates, but being divided in opinion, made no recommendation, leaving the decision to the congregation. Three of the candidates were proposed accordingly, viz.—Mr Archibald M'Murchie, assistant to the Rev. Mr Munro, Rutherglen ; Mr J. M. Porteous, and Mr David Kay. Mr Kay having received only 9 votes was struck off, and a second and final vote being taken, Mr M'Murchie had 27 and Mr Porteous 25 votes. The majority craved the Presbytery to proceed with a call in favour of Mr Porteous. The minority opposed, and the majority agreed to the suggestion of the Presbytery to withdraw both candidates, and proceed with a new election. The result in this case was, that Mr Kay was elected by 22 votes against 20 given for Mr Alexander Carrick. Four of the minority acquiesced, making a majority of 10 for Mr Kay. The Presbytery, finding that the proceedings had been irregular in several respects, in particular, that there had been no meeting of the congregational committee held, and no sufficient means adopted to ascertain the state of feeling throughout the congregation and among the summer adherents previous to proceeding to an election, and that there was still a considerable want of harmony, threatening to issue in serious and permanent division, declined to proceed in the moderation of a call ; and further, considering the critical condition of the congregation at present, and the difficulties involved, refer the case, *in hoc statu*, for advice to the General Assembly.

MR ELDER stated the reference. He trusted that the peculiarities of the case would justify the Presbytery in having brought it up to the Assembly. Innellan is a watering place on the Clyde, which has sprung up into a charge of considerable importance in the Free Church. The permanent population is small, the communion roll numbering about 55,

whereas the summer population amounted to several hundreds, several families of the highest respectability having villas, either as feuars or holding leases of their houses, and residing there during a considerable portion of the year. It is becoming more and more a habit with gentlemen in business in Glasgow to reside, during a great part of the year, at the coast, and the facilities for travelling are naturally increasing this state of things from season to season. It has therefore been a growing conviction with those who have considered this matter that some provision in a reasonable way ought to be made, in the case of a vacancy such as this, for taking into account the mind and feeling of those who, for a great part of the year, are dependent for ordinances on these charges, and who may be the largest contributors for the support of ordinances. He thought he was quite warranted in saying, that if it had not been for the peculiar character of this place, in the above respect, it never would have been a sanctioned charge of the Free Church, and if anything should occur to alienate these summer residents, feuars, and others, they could not contemplate the keeping up of that charge at all. The Presbytery, having regard to this element, as would be seen from the extract minute of 2d January, had agreed, with consent of parties, to the addition to the ordinary committee of the congregation of four—ultimately it was six—of those summer residents to be a consulting committee, with the ordinary committee, in selecting candidates. There was then an election reported to the Presbytery, on 3rd April, when it was manifest there was such a serious division that the Presbytery felt it impossible to go on with a call, and both candidates were withdrawn. At the second election, as per minute of 16th May, a report from the interim moderator of session showed a painfully divided state of things in the congregation, such irregularities having occurred as meetings of session and deacons' courts in absence of the interim moderator, where no minutes were taken; and the fact that no meeting at all of the committee was called previous to the election, so as to ascertain whether there was such a degree of harmony as to warrant the congregation in going forward to an election. It would be for the Assembly to judge whether those irregularities were such as to vitiate the election, and this was one point on which the Presbytery sought advice. Then there was the fact that, while only a majority of ten appeared for Mr Kay, there was a memorial from the minority outstanding stating that the peace of the congregation would be seriously disturbed, if not permanently injured, by his settlement; and it was only right to say that some of the memorialists stated that this was not from any personal objection to Mr Kay, but mainly owing to proceedings connected with his election. And, again, some of their United Presbyterian friends who had been the warmest supporters of the church at Innellan, in consequence of the existing state of things, had taken steps to set up a United Presbyterian Church there, at which a considerable portion of the Free Church congregation have been attending since this second election. In stating this fact he did not mean to throw any injurious reflection upon that body, but, looking at it in another point of view, it certainly had a serious bearing upon the prosperity and permanence of this congregation at Innellan. He hoped, then, the Assembly would sustain this reference and give wise advice on the question how the Presbytery were to deal with the case; for he was convinced more and more that unless

means were devised, by legislation or otherwise, to meet the peculiar circumstances of cases where the congregations were upheld largely by summer visitors—and to take that element in some reasonable way into account—in many instances, such charges must go down or be reduced to mere preaching stations. He should be glad to see a deputation of that House sent down to meet and advise the Presbytery and congregation, in the hope that, by God's blessing, the harmony and prosperity of the congregation may yet be secured.

Dr CANDLISH—Would it serve the Presbytery's purpose, and tend to good, if the General Assembly were to appoint two or three assessors to strengthen their hands in dealing with the case.

Dr M'INTOSH—I think, if I may venture to speak for my brethren, that that is just what we desire.

Mr R. C. SMITH, Glasgow, asked how many of those summer visitors were permanent residents from year to year?

Dr M'INTOSH said the number of parties who resided at Innellan for two, four, or six months of the year was very large. The ordinary winter congregation is about 80, while in summer the church, which accommodates about 400, is full. Some of those summer visitors are also the warmest supporters and have been the most liberal contributors to the funds since the church was built.

Mr ELDER was not prepared to state the exact number resident from year to year; but out of a total of £196 contributed by the Innellan congregation, he was enabled to state that £143 was contributed by the summer visitor class.

In reply to Dr Gibson, Mr ELDER said—Mr Thomson, who took an active part in objecting to the call to Mr Kay, had his name put on the communion roll by the kirk session in March last, and that no objection to it had been stated when the roll was attested by the Presbytery. But he understood Mr Thomson had resided for a considerable part of each year at Innellan for the past eleven years, and had assisted as an elder there, though an elder also in St Matthew's, Glasgow. He has been a most liberal supporter of the cause at Innellan.

The reference was then sustained, and parties removed from the bar.

Dr BUCHANAN said, it seemed to him that the questions put hardly presented the case in the aspect in which it was most necessary to look at it,—namely, whether the circumstances of the congregation being such as Mr Elder had clearly pointed out, they must not, with reference to its actual circumstances, deal with it as an exceptional case. But for summer visitors, it appeared that the congregation would number only about eighty, with a communion roll of fifty-five. He supposed there would be no doubt in the minds of any in that House that the Assembly would not have constituted a congregation so limited in numbers into a regular charge. Though it would have been necessary that some provision should have been made for that limited body of people, he could not imagine that the Church would ever feel itself warranted in constituting such a small body into a sanctioned charge, unless there were room for such speedy growth as he believed the limited extent of the native and permanently resident population at Innellan would not allow. A charge of this kind, then, made up largely of summer visitors, is very peculiarly placed; and if you are not to consult the wishes and feelings of this class—if you altogether ignore that element, the Church would

surely be acting in a very foolish and unreasonable manner, and one very likely to defeat the object you have in view in placing a minister there. It seems clear that you must consult their wishes and desires in some reasonable measure; or, that if you are determined to consult only the constant resident population, you will have to reduce the congregation to a mere preaching station. He was quite prepared to move that the Assembly should appoint assessors to be associated with the Presbytery in dealing with this case, which is an exceptional case, and requires delicate and peculiar handling. It is the first of the kind that has come before the Assembly, and it might be desirable that some principle could be fixed upon for their guidance in such cases; and with that view, though he would be content to add nothing more to the motion, the House might do well to indicate its mind as to the way in which the case should be dealt with for the guidance of the assessors, and not leave it to be supposed that they are to be shut up to the ordinary rule in dealing with congregations.

Dr GIBSON seconded, but on the understanding that he did not concur in all the views expressed by Dr Buchanan. The Presbytery seemed to have thought proper to take up the case very much in relation to the parties who were residents in the district, thus allowing them so far to control the regular congregation. Now, he could not admit that principle. And he maintained, as knowing the district well, that Innellan was entitled to have a Free Church maintained for its population, taking into account the previous history of the congregation and their distance from another Free church. By the course proposed—that of admitting occasional residents to a controlling voice—they were introducing a very dangerous principle, the evils of which had been already exemplified in Arran.

Dr CANDLISH said, it was of importance to keep in view that if it had not been for these summer visitors, it was doubtful whether this church at Innellan would ever have been sanctioned as a charge at all. This is also important as regards the future, for, without in the slightest degree saying that the summer visitors are to override the residents—very far from that—in calling a minister in the ordinary way, it is important these should be informed, else that may raise the question as to the duty of the Church at no distant day, if they shall shrink into a small number of residents, of their being continued upon the equal dividend.

Dr GIBSON—They are not upon the equal dividend; they make application to be put upon it at the present moment.

Dr CANDLISH—Well, it may affect that application very materially. (Laughter.) The question then may be raised whether they are to continue a full ministerial charge or be reduced to a station. But, as urged by Dr Gibson, it would seem as if the case was put in this way, that it was not possible to get a Gaelic-speaking probationer who would be acceptable to both the residents and the summer visitors. (“No Gaelic.”) Well, an acceptable one among all their probationers. (Hear, hear.) Surely it was possible to accomplish this. He saw no better course than that proposed by Dr Buchanan.

Mr ROSE, Poolewe, said, I wish to disabuse the mind of this Assembly of an erroneous impression under which it evidently labours in regard to the conduct of the Innellan congregation. The impression on the mind of the Assembly is, that the native portion of this congregation is

evidently unreasonable, and utterly disregards the interests of the summer visitors in the matter of choosing a minister. I wish most distinctly to state that this is not the character of this congregation. Since they were sanctioned as a ministerial charge, the congregation has had three ministers. In each of these settlements the native portion of the congregation not only considered the interests of the summer visitors, but entered into these settlements very much out of deference to their claims. The district, so far as the native population is considered, though thinly peopled, is a Gaelic-speaking one. There is no Gaelic-speaking minister of the Free Church between Dunoon and Glendonell. Though this was the case, the native portion of the congregation waived their claim to a Gaelic-speaking minister, and agreed, in the interests of the summer residents and visitors, that an English-speaking minister should be settled among them. Consequently Mr Smith, late of that congregation, was settled, and after a ministry of several years, which was highly satisfactory to both sections of the congregation, he went to Australia. Mr M'Donald, now of Nairn, was then called, and in this call also full consideration was given to the interests of the summer visitors. After a ministry of only eleven months—a ministry acceptable to all parties concerned—a call was presented to Mr M'Donald from Nairn, and the Presbytery of Dunoon and Inverary almost urged upon Mr M'Donald the acceptance of that call. The last settlement—that, viz., of Mr Muir—was almost entirely out of deference to the summer residents and visitors. But Mr Muir's health gave way, and he was obliged to resign. Thus, Moderator, the past history of this congregation has, in the particular of consideration for the summer visitors, been most exemplary; and such being the case, it is not right that an entirely different impression regarding them should remain on the mind of the House, and that they should be spoken of as if in reality they were a most unreasonable and impracticable handful of people.

Mr SOMERVILLE, Glasgow, suggested the appointment of a committee to visit Innellan, and that they should be instructed to bring up a report on the general principle involved.

Dr BEGG said the proposal to send assessors was better than appointing a committee with such instructions, which was a step that would require serious consideration. While he admitted that the feelings and wishes of all parties should be consulted, they must hold by the divine rule of the people choosing their own minister, and must not imperil that principle. The impression upon his mind from reading the papers was, that they had been giving these summer residents a sort of formal position in the election which they really could not hold; and no good could come from giving them an indefinite position which they had not the power nor the right to use. For example, the committee of the congregation were to have a consulting committee of four or more of those summer residents. That, he thought, was going too far, and was a step that tended to bring up the very difficulty it was desirable to avoid. (Hear.) The feelings and wishes of the summer residents should have been consulted without this formal step, which might seem at least to be an interference with the rights of the congregation. Another difficulty had arisen from going on with the election at all when so many divisions evidently existed; they all knew that when people got into that position of expressed division, it is extremely difficult to get a right state of feeling brought about again.

Mr SOMERVILLE said Dr Begg's objection did not apply to his proposal after all.

Dr BEGG.—I understood you to mean that the committee should bring up a report on the general subject.

Mr SOMERVILLE.—Yes.

Dr BEGG.—That is what I object to. Sufficient unto the day will be the difficulty thereof. (Laughter.)

Mr DAVIDSON said a mistaken impression seemed to have been taken up as to the actings of the Presbytery. The papers showed that they confined themselves entirely to the residents, and the division brought out was irrespective of summer visitors altogether, although that element, no doubt, had to do with the bringing about of the existing state of matters. And this consulting committee of summer visitors was proposed not at a meeting of Presbytery, but at a meeting of kirk-session, their sole duty, too, being to prepare a list of candidates. It should be clearly understood that the Presbytery had no wish whatever to override the rights of the people of Innellan.

After some remarks from Mr Walker, Carnwath, and Mr Ferguson, North Knapdale, the motion to appoint assessors to act with the Presbytery of Dunoon and Inverary in the case of Innellan was agreed to.

CASE OF TOBERMORY.

The Assembly took up the case of reference from the Presbytery of Lorn and Mull, with respect to Tobermory. Parties were called, when there appeared to state the reference, Mr Cameron, Oban; Mr Graham, Kilbrandon; Mr Mackenzie, Muckairn; and Mr Sutherland, Ardchattan. It appeared there were peculiar difficulties as to the filling up of the vacant pastoral charge at Tobermory. The following is the resolution of the Presbytery resolving to refer the case:—“That, seeing the length of time to which the vacancy has already extended, the injurious effect which the vacancy and the state of strife and irritation accompanying it has upon the interests of the congregation; and considering, farther, the number of vacancies around Tobermory; considering, in short, that (with the exception of the Ross of Mull, which is connected with Iona) the whole island of Mull, with a population of from eight to nine thousand, is at present without the benefit of any settled Free Church minister, the case of Tobermory vacancy be referred for advice to the Free General Assembly.” Dr Candlish said this was a case of very great importance as affecting the interests of the Church, and it was very sad that for so many years the spiritual interests of so large an island should have been put in jeopardy by the prolonged vacancy. It was, therefore, of the last consequence that the hands of the Presbytery should be strengthened.

The General Assembly sustained the reference, and appointed the following ministers to act as assessors to the Presbytery of Lorn and Mull in the case of Tobermory, viz., Dr M'Lauchlan, Mr Elder of Rothesay, Mr Wilson of Dundee, and Professor Gibson.

CASE OF HILLHEAD.

The next case was an application by the Hillhead congregation, Presbytery of Glasgow, to be placed on the equal dividend platform. Dr

Gibson, Mr Ralph Smith, and Mr M'Naught appeared as commissioners from the Presbytery of Glasgow. Mr M'Naught stated that in 1859, four years after the station at Hillhead was sanctioned as a ministerial charge, Mr M'Lachlan was ordained. The congregation, previous to his settlement, was in a disorganised state; and when he entered on his labours there were few sittings let, only forty-eight members on the communion-roll, and a debt of five hundred pounds on the church. The attendance on Sabbath was forty, and at the prayer meeting six. Since that time not fewer than one hundred and ninety-two persons had passed through his hands to the communion; and though the mining population was essentially migratory, the membership was one hundred and forty. One hundred and forty sittings were now let, and the large debt was entirely removed. The attendance on the Lord's-day averaged one hundred and sixty, at the congregational prayer meeting forty, at mothers' meetings in private houses, twelve, and at the Bible-class fully sixty. The sum remitted to the Sustentation Fund last year was seventy-five pounds three shillings and two pence, being a larger sum than nine of the eighteen extension charges admitted to the platform of the equal dividend transmitted to that fund; and that sum would be considerably increased this year. Other charges, sanctioned by the General Assembly, on more stringent terms than Hillhead, had been put on the platform of the equal dividend of the Sustentation Fund. When the church was sanctioned, a provision was made that no claim should be made on behalf of it on the Church Extension Fund, but that it should be entitled to receive back its own contributions up to the full amount of the equal dividend. Yet, in 1865, when twelve extension charges were admitted to the platform of the equal dividend, and in 1866, when six were admitted, the charge of Hillhead was passed over, and left entirely to depend on its own resources. The conditions on which Hillhead was sanctioned, while excluded from being a burden on the Church Extension Fund, did not exclude it from the benefit of the Sustentation Fund. The income of the minister had not been one hundred pounds a year since the settlement of the church.

Mr M'GREGOR, Paisley, moved that the church of Hillhead be recommended to the committee to be put on the equal dividend platform. He alluded to the difficulties under which Mr M'Lachlan had laboured, and said that an influential faction of the Free Church people had given their influence against Mr M'Lachlan, who had enjoyed nothing like the advantages a minister required in such a charge. He argued that this was one of the most suitable charges that could be selected for the equal dividend platform.

The General Assembly hereby recalled the restriction under which the congregation of Hillhead was placed in 1855, viz., "That no claim shall be made on behalf of it on the Church Extension Fund."

Dr BEGG said it was evident two distinct things were asked—first, that the disability which at present existed should be removed; and secondly, that the church should be admitted to the equal dividend platform. It was only the first that the Assembly could deal with at present, the other might be proposed when the report of the committee on the platform of the equal dividend was given in. He thought undoubtedly the disability ought to be removed. He moved that the restriction should

be recalled which provided that no claim should be made on the Church Extension Fund by the church at Hillhead.

Mr COWAN, Troon, seconded the motion, which was unanimously agreed to.

CASE OF MARSHALL CHURCH, KIRKINTILLOCH.

The Assembly took up the consideration of an application by the congregation of Marshall Church, Kirkintilloch, to have the congregation admitted to the platform of the equal dividend. It was stated in the application that for the past twenty years or more the congregation has paid as a minimum stipend to their minister £150, exclusive of an occasional grant from the Ferguson Bequest; that it has been contributing all the time to all the other schemes of the Church, and that with an amount of liberality, considering their number and means, equal to that of any other congregation in the Presbytery; and that therefore they are not likely to become a burden on the funds. It was further stated that the object of the kirk-session and deacons' court in making the application was "because of the moral support which the fact will confer on the congregation in the community;" "that the trials to which the congregation has been subjected, the harmonious feeling pervading the congregation, and the efficiency of its staff of office-bearers, together with the approaching settlement of Mr Brown, render this application peculiarly urgent, and would render success peculiarly welcome." The Assembly, without hearing parties, removed the restriction by which this charge was originally prevented from having any claim on the funds of the Church.

MONDAY, MAY 27.

ADDRESS TO HER MAJESTY.

Mr WILSON, Dundee, read the following address to Her Majesty, drawn up by a committee appointed on Thursday:—

"To the Queen's most Excellent Majesty.

"May it please your Majesty,—

"We, the ministers and elders of the Free Church of Scotland, met in General Assembly, embrace this opportunity of congratulating your Majesty on the happy return of the anniversary of your Majesty's birth, and of renewing the expression of our ardent attachment to your Majesty's person, and loyalty to your Majesty's throne.

"Attached as we are to those principles of civil and religious liberty for which our forefathers contended, and succeeded in establishing, we are very thankful to Almighty God, the ruler among the nations, that it has pleased Him to place your Majesty on the throne of this great realm, a sovereign whose personal qualities and eminent domestic virtues have contributed so much, not only to bless the country, but to secure a place for your Majesty in the hearts of all your subjects.

"We venture to assure your Majesty that it is our constant endeavour to encourage in our people a loyal and affectionate attachment to your

Majesty's person and family and government, and that now, as always, it is our earnest and affectionate prayer to the God of all grace, that he would bless your Majesty with all temporal mercies, and all spiritual blessings, in all heavenly places, in Christ Jesus.

"May it please your Majesty, we, your Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects," &c., &c.

The address was adopted.

MISSION PUBLICATIONS.

Dr RAINY gave in the report of the Committee on Mission Publications, (No. XIII.) In connexion with the *Record*, Dr Rainy said they had this year made some improvement with respect to which suggestions had been made repeatedly from various quarters—improvements in the appearance and usefulness of the *Record* in the publishing department. But he should be misleading the House if he led them to suppose any very essential or substantial change had been made in the *Record* in this department, or that such change was likely to prove practicable, so long as the House abides by the conviction it has hitherto maintained, that they ought not to have less printed matter, and so long as the price did not exceed a penny. Comparisons had been made between the *Record* and publications subsidised by other bodies; but he did not see that in the publishing department much could be done, unless they were prepared to contemplate changes of a more extensive kind, and changes which it would be difficult to adjust to the interests of the various schemes. The conveners of the schemes had always made it manifest that they deprecated the reduction of the size of the paper and the amount of printed matter; and so long as they had to provide the amount of printed matter at the price, they must conform to the circumstances in which they were placed. He thought a good deal might be done in the way of improving the circulation of the *Record*. Sometimes figures had been named beyond what could reasonably be expected, but he did not think it would be an unreasonable thing—even having regard to the peculiarities of the Gaelic-speaking population—to expect the circulation to reach 40,000. He wished to take the opportunity of renewing the suggestion thrown out formerly—whether congregations might not see their way to take a sufficient number of the *Record*, to circulate them among the adherents of their Church, and rely upon collections to meet the expense. He believed that had been found a very successful way of promoting the interests of the Church, and of giving a tangible expression of the interest of the Church in their schemes. If the information in the *Record* were brought systematically before the Church, even the facing of a little expense at first would be found to be productive of very large and beneficial fruit. He could not conclude without expressing the obligations of the committee to one distinguished convener who had taken a very lively interest in the *Record*, and had done a great deal to make practical such improvements as had been carried through. He referred to the convener of the Indian Mission Committee, Dr Duff, and he trusted that in reappointing the committee the Assembly would add to it the name of Dr Duff.

Principal LUMSDEN, Aberdeen, said they could not over-estimate the importance of the *Record* as a means of indicating to the Church the

progress of their various missionary schemes. He could not help thinking very much might be done to increase the circulation were ministers to take frequent opportunities of commending the *Record* to the perusal of the members. With regard to the Gaelic-speaking population, he thought it might be worthy of consideration whether some means could not be devised for translating, periodically at least, portions of the *Record* into the language with which that population was familiar. (Applause.) By this a great deal of good might be done in the way of binding together very firmly and intelligently their Gaelic-speaking brethren with themselves. He was sure they were all sensible of the improvement in the *Record*, and they could not be too thankful to the wisdom and generosity of the publisher for the care he bestowed upon all matters connected with the advancement of its circulation. He begged to move the approval of the report, and that the committee be reappointed—the name of Dr Duff being added to it.

Mr A. M'DOUGALL, Glasgow, thought that if the Assembly were at the expense of circulating the *Record* in English to a larger extent, it would save the expense of translating it into Gaelic, and do more good.

Mr ROSE, Minard, wished to state that translations of the *Record*, and of the other general intelligence of the Church, were greatly required in the Highland parishes. He would hail with much satisfaction some means by which the missionary intelligence of the Church could be given to the Gaelic-speaking population.

Dr GIBSON was of opinion that there were large districts which could not be benefited by the English *Record*, and which could not be really interested in the schemes of the Church, unless means were found to have the information conveyed to them in their own language.

Dr BUCHANAN believed that the greater proportion of those who could read Gaelic could also read English, while those who could read neither language could only understand Gaelic. It was very important that the latter class should have the opportunity of hearing the information read to them in their own language.

Dr BEGG thought Dr Buchanan's suggestion was really the practical solution of the difficulty. He did not believe a separate Gaelic periodical would, in a financial point of view, serve the purpose; and the Church would probably pause before it entered upon a speculation of that sort; but he did not see why their ministers, both in the Highlands and in the Lowlands, might not do something in bringing the matter in the *Record* before the public. There was no reason why their Gaelic ministers should not take a little pains in translating into Gaelic such information as was important for the public to know. That would involve no financial loss, and would be a very obvious way of bringing the information before the minds of their Gaelic people.

Mr MACKENZIE, Kilmorack, said that, as a Gaelic-speaking minister, he found great difficulty in getting his English-speaking members to take the *Record*, and the few who would take it in Gaelic would not compensate for the expense of translation. He would be glad, however, if a cheap abstract of the contents of the *Record* could be furnished which they could communicate to their people.

Dr RAINY observed that the matter of a Gaelic translation of the *Record* had been under the consideration of the committee, but they never saw through the financial part of it.

Dr DAVID BROWN, Aberdeen, said it was evident the impression of the Gaelic ministers was, that the translation would not compensate for the expense, and would not serve the end of indicating to the Gaelic-speaking population the contents of the *Record*. He therefore thought it would be a pity if the Assembly were influenced by the judgment of those who could not be so competent to speak on a matter of this kind; and from what he had heard, he was inclined to say that all the ends could be served by the Gaelic ministers translating portions of the *Record*, without incurring the expense of printing a separate edition.

The motion was then agreed to.

DISTRIBUTION OF PROBATIONERS.

Mr MACKENZIE, Dunfermline, in giving in the report of the Committee on Distribution of Probationers (No. XVI.), said this matter had been hitherto on a very unsatisfactory footing, being left in a great degree to mere casualty on the part of congregations; while, in the case of probationers, there was often a rush of applicants, each with a bundle of certificates, as if it were the situation of some gate, or level-crossing keeper they were after, and not the case of a man offering himself for trial and experience of his gifts as one worthy the name of a probationer in a Christian Church. The consequences are injurious, and lowering to the character of probationers; and if it is lowering to a class, it is lowering to the individual who puts himself more or less in the position of developing such undisguised selfishness, self-seeking, and forwardness; while the modest and retiring young man is the last to put himself forward. This year, for the first time in their history as a Church, something like satisfactory action had been taken to remedy this state of matters. There has existed for some years back a scheme for the distribution of probationers, which wanted little but to be transmuted from permissive into obligatory to render it all that the memorial of the students craves. For the success of the scheme during the past year, they were indebted entirely to the secretary, Mr Josiah Sinclair. (Applause.) His tact and energy in carrying out the scheme was worthy of all praise. But the scheme must be unsatisfactory to a certain degree, so long as its powers are of that permissive character. Congregations do not require to come under it unless they like, and probationers also know that they may take their position upon the roll without the intervention of the committee; and thus the matter must go on in many cases in the former hap-hazard way. Another point that must be provided for is the matter of expense; and there are various other things of a subordinate nature that call for attention. The request of the committee was, that probationers should be enjoined to come forward in accordance with the scheme, and in no other way, and that congregations co-operate also with them. Four years ago congregations were enjoined to take fortnightly supply from the committee. The committee now desired that Mr Sinclair should be communicated with, and men sent down regularly in succession to preach. They thought there should be no intermeddling with vacant congregations at all, but the whole be arranged as a simple matter of business—that no probationer should be entitled to preach with a view to a call except through the committee. If this were made obligatory, they ventured to hope that the work of the committee would go on satisfactorily from year to year.

Dr BEGG said the labours of Mr Mackenzie, with the effective help of Mr Sinclair, had very nearly brought about a solution of this important problem, and it would be exceedingly to be deprecated if the Assembly did not give the committee every facility in carrying out their object. The theory of the Church is, that the moment a congregation becomes vacant, it falls into the hands of the Presbytery, and that arrangements till the vacancy is filled up must be made by the Presbytery's authority. Now, it is of great importance that Presbyteries should act in such a way as to facilitate the operations of this committee. The suggestions made are, that every vacancy be reported to the committee; and, secondly, that, as far as possible, the arrangements made for supplying it shall be made only through the committee. In the student's memorial a more modest proposal was put forth; but the more the matter is considered the more it will be seen that their suggestions did not meet the whole case. So long as the arrangement continues of the congregation making supply every second Sabbath, there will be confusion, and the chance of men sent by the committee being heard on less favourable terms than those selected by the congregation, and of whom they may have more or less private knowledge. (Hear, hear.) In making their proposal, the committee did not intend to interfere in the least with any congregation which might indicate its desire to hear particular probationers; it is expressly provided that they should be indulged, as far as possible, in hearing the probationers they may desire to hear. All they wished was, that such probationers, and those coming in the ordinary way, should go with the same authority. Another point was, that when a student is licensed, the fact should be at once communicated to the committee, in place of leaving them to find it out from the newspapers. Again, the system of formal certificates, printed and sent round the congregations, should be as far as possible prohibited. (Hear, hear.) The notion that the probationer must go about canvassing as a man would do for an ordinary situation should be repudiated. (Hear.) The true theory is, that every man who has gone through the curriculum of the Hall is to be considered qualified, and instead of devolving the duty of judging of his gifts upon any man, or set of men, however great or learned, the people should judge of them for themselves. At the same time, he would not go the length of saying that they should not satisfy themselves in every way by private inquiry as to the character of the men they are to choose. The question is a very important one, and everything in the way of forcing men upon them, by influence from without, should be discouraged. In some churches they carry this to the extent of not allowing a man, when he proposed a candidate, to make a speech, in case he should quote the opinion of some one; and this rule worked very well. Another thing which he hoped very few in their Church had done was this—ministers leaving one congregation for another actually taking steps to fill the vacancy before it was created—acting, in a sense, as patrons of the congregation. He thought ministers should not interfere in such cases. (Hear, hear.) The only other part of the report was that of finance, and he must say he thought that, even should the proper working of this scheme cost something, the money would not be misspent. He moved, "That the General Assembly approve generally of the report, and record its thanks to the committee, and especially to the convener, and enjoin Presbyteries to have respect to the suggestions

contained in the report in the filling up of vacancies, and in connexion with the licensing of students. They also authorise the committee to confer with the Sustentation and Home Mission Committees in regard to the expense necessary to the proper working of the scheme."

Some conversation followed, Dr Buchanan, Mr Macgregor, Paisley, and others, expressing a difficulty as to the motion as implying approval of the regulations.

Dr BEGG said his motion pointed only at a general approval, and was framed with the view of securing for the committee the authority which he thought the whole of that House would be willing to give them.

Mr ADAM, Aberdeen, said it still left indefinite what it was wished to make obligatory, which had hitherto been permissive.

Professor DOUGLAS said, perhaps the wisest course would be to send this report down to Presbyteries—not in terms of the Barrier Act, which he believed would be mischievous, but to get the mind of Presbyteries in the way that had been done in other cases; and if this were done, he would suggest that Presbyteries, which were the seats of divinity halls, should appoint committees to meet with the students on the subject—(hear)—whom they ought to deal with tenderly in such a matter, though not formally giving them a voice in regulating it. With regard to the matter of certificates, the best way to check the use of them would be to point out to the Church and congregations that they are really of much less value in such cases than is supposed, being pretty frequently written by those who know least about the holders of them. (Hear, hear.)

Mr COWAN, Troon, expressed the opinion that they were not prepared at this stage to come to a decision. He suggested that there should be no approval of the report meanwhile, but that the committee be instructed to confer, and report to a future diet.

Professor RAINY was very much of the mind of Mr Cowan. He did not think they could hammer out a deliverance just now without too great a waste of time; and would propose, that "The Assembly approve generally of the report, and remit the proposals contained in it to the committee, with instructions to confer with the Home Mission, Sustentation, and Finance Committees, and to bring up a proposed deliverance to a future diet of this Assembly."

Dr BEGG acquiesced in this proposal, which was accordingly agreed to.

RETURNS TO OVERTURES.

The Assembly called for the report of the committee appointed to class returns to the overtures sent down to Presbyteries by last Assembly, which was given in and read by Mr Main, the Convener. It appeared from it that 39 Presbyteries had approved of the Overture anent the representation of Presbyteries, that 9 Presbyteries had disapproved of it, and that 24 Presbyteries had made no return. The Assembly finding that this overture had been approved of by a majority of Presbyteries, passed it into a standing law of the Church and enacted:—"That hereafter, when a charge has been sanctioned for the first time, it shall not be counted as increasing the number of the charges in a Presbytery, with a view to representation, until a pastor has been inducted into it."

OVERTURE ANENT CHAIR OF EVANGELISTIC THEOLOGY.

It appeared from the report that the overture anent a Chair of

Evangelistic Theology had been approved of by 54 Presbyteries, that 15 Presbyteries had made no return, and that the remaining 3 had approved with such conditions as must cause their returns to be counted as disapprovals. The Assembly, finding that this overture had been approved of by a majority of Presbyteries, passed it into a standing law, enacting:—"That a Professorship of Evangelistic Theology be established in this Church, the Professor to be chosen by the General Assembly of 1867, and to be a member of the Senatus of the New College, Edinburgh, but to lecture also, from time to time, on subjects connected with the duty and privilege of spreading the Gospel throughout the world, in the other Colleges, in conformity with arrangements to be made by the College Committee in concert with the authorities of each of these Colleges; the salary of the said Professor to be paid from the annual interest of a sum of £10,000, which has been subscribed by friends of missions, and is now available for the permanent endowment of it. In passing this Act, the General Assembly think it right to record that they have had communicated to them, on sufficient authority, the wish of the liberal founders of the Professorship, to the following effect—that, without prejudice to the free discretion of the Church in filling up vacancies, regard should be had to the peculiar character of this Chair, as one that must very largely deal with the subject of foreign missions; and that if there should be any missionary, or retired missionary, thoroughly qualified in the judgment of the Church at large, whose services might be secured, he should have a preference over other candidates."

APPOINTMENT OF DR DUFF TO THE CHAIR.

The Assembly called for the report of the Committee on the Election of Professors, which was read by Dr Beith. It appeared from the report that returns as to the appointment of a Professor to the Chair of Evangelistic Theology had been received from 61 Presbyteries and 10 Synods; that these returns all agreed in suggesting to the committee that they should recommend the election of Dr Alexander Duff, and that the committee made this recommendation.

Principal CANDLISH then said—I have great pleasure in proposing that Dr Alexander Duff should, following out the unexampled unanimity of the Presbyteries and Synods, be elected to this chair. We know that the establishment of this chair is largely owing to Dr Duff's name and reputation and influence; and we know that the appointment which has been so cordially proposed is in entire accordance with the wishes of the donors—(applause)—of those liberal friends who have enabled the Church to set up this Chair. They very generously abstain from making any condition at all as regards even the first appointment. They have left that entirely in the hands of the Church; and the result has proved that they were right in doing so, and that they might safely trust to the good sense and good feeling of the Church. Of course it would be altogether impertinent in me to expatiate on the claims which Dr Duff has to this honour, in so far as it is an honour and not a duty. I say it would be impertinent in me to venture on any eulogium or on any setting forth of the claims of Dr Duff to this Chair. I suppose that throughout the whole bounds of our Church we could not possibly have put our finger on any individual who could come within a hundred miles of Dr Duff as regards qualification for this particular Chair—(applause)—and I rejoice

exceedingly that it is to be in his hands in the first place, for I very cordially concur with those who would deprecate any minute regulations or any particular arrangement as regards this Chair in the first instance. The setting up of this Chair is certainly a sort of experiment; and we require the benefit of the experience of a few years—and long may he be spared to discharge its duties—under so eloquent a lecturer and so effective a missionary as Dr Duff, by which time he will have become so conversant with the Professors of the several Colleges and with the students as to be able to suggest to the Church more particular arrangements, and a more detailed constitution. I rejoice therefore in the overture, as regards this matter, that very large discretion and liberty is left to Dr Duff to carry out such views as may seem to him best. He will there have opportunities of acquiring experience in this direction, so that in the course of a few years he may be in a position to advise the Church fully on the subject. All that is designed in the overture is, that Dr Duff should be the Professor of Evangelistic Theology, that he should be a member of the Senatus of the New College of Edinburgh, and that he should be also called upon to lecture in the other Colleges, from time to time, on subjects connected with the duty and privilege of spreading the Gospel throughout the world, in accordance with arrangements to be made by the College Committee, in concert with the authorities of these Colleges. I have another remark to make, and it is that it must be perfectly clear that a professorship of this nature must have very large reference to the subject of foreign missions; but I rejoice that it is not to be strictly limited to this subject. It is generally for the purpose of stirring up men's minds, and the minds of the students, to a right spirit as regards the evangelisation of the world, both at home and abroad. Of course, as might be expected, the field abroad being the widest and most difficult perhaps, a large measure of attention must be paid to foreign missions; but even those prelections and conversations—for I anticipate as much from Dr Duff's conversations as from his lectures—as much from his personal intercourse with the students as from his prelections in the class—and all that he can do in the way of stirring up zeal on behalf of the foreign missions, will tell in the direction of awakening kindred zeal on behalf of home missions. (Applause.) The spirit is the same that is demanded for all missionaries, whether at home or abroad, so that whatever time and attention Dr Duff can pay to the subject of foreign missions will be all available for stirring up the minds of our students; and a missionary spirit will be evoked at home as well as abroad and in the colonies. I do not therefore look upon the preference, or the large measure of time and attention, that will be necessarily given to foreign missions, as in any way a deduction from the time that will be given to other missionary and evangelistic topics; for all will tend in the direction of awakening a missionary spirit and missionary zeal on the part of our students. I close by saying, without, in doing so, throwing a single reflection on our students attending the hall, who, I believe, are decidedly in advance in many ways of those who were attending it many years ago, that, judging from the experience I have had in the College, and from the information which I have received in regard to the other Colleges, that if there is one thing more needed than another in regard to our Colleges, it is an outpouring of the Holy Spirit on the professors and students, and the awakening, through that out-

pouring, of a more earnest concern for the salvation of a lost world. I believe that many will derive benefit from the setting up of this Chair largely through the outpouring of the Spirit; and under the generous impulse and stimulating earnestness of Dr Duff, we may, with the blessing of God, look for a decided revival of missionary zeal among the students of our Colleges. (Applause.) I beg leave to move accordingly.

Dr BLAIKIE said—I took the liberty in the Presbytery of Edinburgh, when the duty of recommending a professor to this Chair was before us, of stating that the only difficulty one could have in agreeing to recommend Dr Duff to that office, arose from the fear that that appointment would cause him to resign the office he at present holds of convener of the Foreign Mission Committee; and I said that as a member of the Foreign Mission Committee I knew so well the immense value of the services that Dr Duff was rendering to that scheme as convener, and the immense importance of his services being in some form continued, that a very serious doubt arose in my mind whether the claims of the Chair were really superior to those of the convenship. Holding this view, I should have been under the necessity of asking the Assembly to look at that question on the present occasion; but I am happy to be freed from the responsibility of introducing the question, and likewise from the duty of making any statement in my own name, because I am asked by the Foreign Mission Committee to lay on the table of the Assembly the minute of a special meeting held this morning of the committee bearing on this subject; and likewise, I am happy to say, indicating a solution of the difficulty to which I have referred. Dr Blaikie then read the minute, which, after referring to the circumstances that led to Dr Duff's appointment as convener, to the way in which he had managed the business of the mission, to the enlarged plans for the consolidation and expansion of the mission which he had originated, and to the influence he was exercising in the promotion of a missionary spirit, indicated the great desirableness of his continuing to act as convener, and pointed to the appointment of Dr Murray Mitchell and Dr Thomas Smith as vice-conveners, by whom the main burden of the correspondence might be undertaken, as an arrangement that would be very acceptable to the committee, and, as they hoped, agreeable to the feelings of these two honoured brethren. I hope (said Dr Blaikie, in continuation) that it will not be thought that the Foreign Mission Committee have gone out of their proper sphere in laying before the Assembly this minute; and I trust it will be felt that it was incumbent on that committee to testify here to the high sense which they entertain of the remarkable services which Dr Duff has rendered to this scheme, and to let it be known that there is nothing they would more deprecate than his removal from the position of the actual as well as the nominal head of our foreign mission undertaking. I think the Assembly will rejoice to know that the difficulty that otherwise might have caused hesitation to many in going into this appointment is now in the fair way of being removed. (Applause.) I know quite well that it is not on the present occasion, but when the report of the Foreign Mission Committee comes up to be considered by the Assembly in the ordinary course, that any arrangements, such as those pointed out here, fall to be considered and settled; but I have no doubt that the Assembly will be glad to know that these two

members of the Foreign Mission Committee, highly qualified as Dr Murray Mitchell and Dr Smith are, may probably see their way to agree to undertake the necessarily heavy labour of the correspondence, in order that the Church may retain the present convener in that office which he has so nobly held for the last three years. (Applause.)

Professor DOUGLAS moved, as a rider to Dr Candlish's motion, "That the terms of this appointment shall not be held to preclude the question whether future appointments of professors shall be made for life or not." He put this rider in such a way as that it might be understood that there was nothing to stand peculiarly in connexion with this Chair that it should not be open to the Church to decide in regard to other Chairs. (Hear, hear.) He thought it must depend upon the position of the Church at any particular time on the one hand, and on the other hand upon the nature of the duties to which any particular professor was called, whether the man ought to hold it for life or for a term of years. This was a most fitting time—now that this Chair was about to be settled—to determine clearly that the appointment of professors for life should not be made a matter of principle, and that it should be left for consideration whether there were any reasons for making appointments only for temporary purposes. There was no reason why there should not be differences in the tenure of professorships. At Oxford some of the professors held their Chairs for life; others held them only for a time, and with the happiest results. In Scotch Universities many Chairs were held to the exclusion of other offices; but others (such as medical and legal Chairs) were held in connexion with the practice to which the holders of the Chairs had devoted themselves. Coming nearer their own halls, the question whether their principals ought to be professors exclusively had never been raised till the latest appointment, when a man was lately appointed principal of one of their halls, he being a town minister. He should like the present question to be left open to be discussed when the matter arose; and his opinion was that when the time came light would be thrown on the nature of this Chair, so as to leave them all at one regarding it.

Mr COWAN, Troon, seconded the motion.

Dr BEGG objected to the adoption of this addition. It seemed to him that, as a general rule, it was never advisable to legislate or to make settlements that were not called for by the existing circumstances of the Church. It would be extremely inexpedient for the Church to raise the general question at the present moment, and he thought that Dr Candlish's motion exhausted the existing duty of the Church.

Mr ADAM, Aberdeen, could not support the motion of Professor Douglas, on the ground that it brought in the general question as to the appointment of their professors.

Mr MURRAY DUNLOP, M.P., (elder,) said he did not see any necessity for Professor Douglas's motion, because the question was an open question, and could be raised at any moment. At the same time, he saw nothing unconstitutional in it, although it was quite unnecessary.

Mr WALTER WOOD, Elie, hoped that, after the strong and distinct statement of Mr Dunlop, Professor Douglas would withdraw his motion.

Dr CANDLISH did not see anything unconstitutional in appointing professors for a term of years, but he doubted whether that could be done

without an overture receiving the consent of Presbyteries. It would be open, however, to any one to raise the question at any time, and to overture the Assembly to consider whether the appointment to the Chairs should be left an open question.

Professor DOUGLAS, with consent of his seconder, accordingly agreed to withdraw his motion, on the ground that the conversation did not give evidence that the opinion was generally held that anything more would be needed at any time than a vote of the Assembly.

Mr M'GREGOR, Paisley, thought the House should not allow the motion to be withdrawn. He thought no harm could be done by the Assembly declaring what was the fact regarding the professorship, and whether, in making this appointment permanent, they left it an open question whether it should be always permanent.

Dr RAINY suggested to Mr M'Gregor whether his views might not be satisfied by bringing in an overture through the committee at a future diet of the Assembly.

Mr M'GREGOR said if that were competent, so as to separate this discussion from the person of Dr Duff, he would be very much relieved.

Sir HENRY MONCREIFF said it was quite competent to bring up the matter by overture.

The motion proposed by Dr Candlish was unanimously agreed to.

Dr Duff was then introduced by Dr Candlish, and was greeted with loud applause—the Assembly and the audience rising to receive him.

The MODERATOR (addressing Dr Duff) said—It is my duty to inform you that, by the unanimous voice of the Assembly, or rather, I may say, by the unanimous voice of the Church, the Assembly have appointed you professor in connexion with the Chair of Evangelistic Theology, and we expect that much good will result from your acceptance of the office. (Applause.)

Dr DUFF, in reply, said—Moderator, fathers and brethren, before giving my answer to the announcement which has now been made, I may be permitted to make a very brief and plain statement, in order to remove certain doubts and obscurities that have been hanging over the subject, and are still hanging over it in various quarters. I do not mean to address you in any formal or elaborate manner on this occasion; but as various questions have arisen, I think it well that the cloudy misapprehensions connected with them should be at once dissipated. I was asked only the other day what was the object of this Chair of Evangelistic Theology, and whence came its designation? Let me, then, in one sentence, state that at an early period, when passing through the theological curriculum at St Andrews, I was struck markedly with this circumstance, that throughout the whole course of the curriculum of four years, not one single allusion was ever made to the subject of the world's evangelisation—the subject which constitutes the chief end of the Christian Church on earth. I felt intensely that there was something wrong in this omission. According to a just conception of the Church of Christ, the grand function it has to discharge in this world cannot be said to begin and end in the preservation of internal purity of doctrine, discipline, and government. All this is merely for burnishing it so as ^{to} be a lamp to give light, not to itself only, but also to the world. ^{Let} must be an outcome of that light, lest it prove useless, and the ^{form} ^{be} lost and extinguished. Why has it got that light, but that ^{the} ^{of} ^{the}

freely impart it to others? Years afterwards, on the banks of the Ganges, we heard that this Free Church had determined to set up its Hall of Theology, and that Dr Welsh had succeeded so remarkably in procuring funds—thanks to those who have been so liberal since, the merchant princes of Glasgow!—that, besides the ordinary theological chairs, there were to be Chairs of Natural Science, Logic, and Moral Philosophy—all demanded by the peculiar necessities of the times. I could not help feeling that now was the time for advancing a step further, and, on the spur of the moment, was led to write to my noble friend Dr Gordon, the convener of the Indian Foreign Missions to the effect, that surely this was the time and occasion for setting up a Chair for Missions—in short, a missionary professorship—that, as the Free Church, in her General Assembly, had started as a Missionary Church, her New College should start as a Missionary College. (Applause.) In so doing, I could not help writing in this manner—I see that the old-fashioned commonplace nomenclature is coming to an end: we were accustomed to talk of the evidences of Christianity, of the evidences of natural and revealed religion: but these are too commonplace now, and we have nothing but apologetics and apologetic theology. And so with regard to doctrine. We were accustomed to talk of the history of doctrine, but now I hear of nothing but dogmatics and dogmatic theology. (Laughter.) Some, it was added, may very likely have an objection to the old term of missions, as too homely and familiar; and therefore if such a Chair as this is to be set up—following the analogy of these other terms—you may call it the Chair of Evangelistic Theology. (Laughter and applause.)

On my return from India I talked of the subject to various influential men in the Church; amongst others to the late Dr Cunningham, who approved highly of the object; but even he did not think the time was ripe for it. Crossing the Atlantic, I was wont to talk of it much to our friends in America, and there was one Synod of the Presbyterian Church there that agreed to instruct one professor of theology to make this a distinct subject of his prelections—namely, to lecture on evangelistic theology; and that is the only lectureship of the kind that I know of. On my last return I felt intensely, looking at the state of the country generally, that there was still much need of such a professorship, and perhaps the more need, because the world is more agitated than ever, and young men more flighty, because of the multitude of openings in every direction; and that there was on many grounds, alike theoretic and practical, a decided call for an institution of this description. Talking about it to various parties, I found many difficulties in the way. At last, however, the prime or chief difficulty seemed to be connected with the means of sustaining such a professorship. It could not be established with the funds at the disposal of the College Committee, already too inadequate, and it seemed as if there must be a separate endowment for it. It was this that originated the idea of obtaining a special endowment for the Chair of Evangelistic Theology. On that occasion one and another asked me who would be proposed as professor, and some suggested that I might allow my own name to be proposed. “No,” I said, ^{mot.} I peremptorily decline it on many grounds, particularly on the Dr ^{of} my health”—my health being such that for days and weeks, and professors for ¹⁴hs, I was a victim to almost continuous pain and suffering. I

said—"It is impossible; I cannot, as an honest man, look at it." Therefore the idea of my having nothing to do with it in the way of being appointed to the Chair emboldened me the more to go forth and plead the cause among those who were able and willing to help it. If I had had any eye towards the Chair myself, I could not have asked for a single farthing, lest it should have been liable to misapprehension, and lest it should have been thought I was looking after self-aggrandisement in some form or another; but, having relinquished the idea of such an object, I could plead boldly for it because it was for some one else. (Applause.)

At last Assembly it was announced that the sum of £10,000 had become available for this purpose from members of this Church, and from members of other Churches, who had confidence that the Free Church would faithfully carry out the design. It was assumed, taken for granted as a matter of course, that if the professorship was to be endowed, it should, with respect to tenure and term of office, be put on the same footing with the other professorships—that whatever was the character of the other professorships at our College, this Chair should partake of that character, be it what it might. And then one other thing, which was assumed, taken for granted as a matter of course, was, that whilst the great leading principles connected with all evangelic missions are the same, whatever be their objects, whether at home or abroad, it was felt that the vast foreign unevangelised world of heathenism was that which should occupy the largest share of attention; and, therefore, that the person appointed to such an office ought to be one who had experience of the foreign mission field, and who would be able to guide and direct those who were to be sent forth as missionaries.

One other point I feel myself bound, under a sense of gratitude to the God of Providence, to state, because it will not be misapprehended in an assembly like this. If I were addressing a body of unbelievers, it might be different, but I am addressing a body of Christian men. Since last year, every one knows, a terrible crisis has gone over our land, in which many noble men have suffered by no fault of their own, and it so happens that some of the principal contributors to the fund were among the number; and about the eleventh hour it seemed as if it were impossible that the means for a full endowment should be forthcoming. This, I confess, caused a great deal of anxiety, as any one may readily suppose. What is one to do in such a case? Cast thy burden upon the Lord; pour out thine heart before Him in earnest prayer and supplication for direction. I have no hesitation, because it will not be misapprehended here, in saying that I was led to dwell on the character and doings of Gideon, who asked a sign, not on account of want of faith, but rather to confirm the faith he had, so that he might go forth in the fulness of his strength. So I was driven in this manner to feel—if it be the will of the Lord that this projected plan should not go forward, let it be seen that it is so by the withholding of the means that are necessary to establish it, and then I will stop and humbly bow with resignation to *His* holy will; if, on the other hand, it be of God, and if it be God's design and purpose, then, as He has the hearts of all men at His disposal, let Him put it into the hearts of those who are able and willing to come forward at the eleventh hour for deliverance. "Whilst yet praying"—I may almost use the words of Scripture—a letter came from one of the

most generous of the contributors who knew the circumstances, to this effect—"Rather than that this great enterprise should be arrested, at the risk of being upset, it may be for ever, I and one or two more are willing to guarantee what is needed to make up this fund; and a small effort can be made, at your own convenience, to relieve us of it, if you think proper to do so." (Applause.) I felt this to be an answer to prayer, and thanked God for it. I think it is a dreadful time we are coming to, when we have men called Christians, aye, and Christian ministers too, who go the length of denying the efficacy of prayer. (Applause.) But this was not all—God be praised! Let us wait on Him and we shall see wonders some day. The next day another message reached me, of a still more remarkable kind, from another of the contributors, who was cognisant of the real circumstances of the case. He said—"I think so-and-so (naming another gentleman) may take up the obligation of so-and-so, and as to the rest, I have made up my mind to relieve you of all carefulness as to the remaining £2000, *on one condition*, that my name be not publicly mentioned." (Applause.)

I feel bound to record these facts, mark you, as I again repeat it, to the praise and glory of Jehovah, the prayer-hearing and prayer-answering God. But, not unduly to detain you, let me come to the appointment itself. Up till the time of last Assembly it was understood that there was one of our retired missionaries who had been pointed out as particularly suited for this office; so much was this looked upon as the case, that it was taken for granted that when the time came that honoured and retired missionary would be nominated for the appointment. After last Assembly it turned out that there was a difference of judgment in some quarters on the subject, and that another of our retired missionaries would be proposed. Afterwards it still further turned out that there were parties satisfied neither with the one nor with the other, and who wanted a competent home minister appointed to the Chair. Thus it seemed, about the middle of last autumn, as if there would be a discussion throughout all the Presbyteries of the Church, which might be of a somewhat painful kind. About the same time also it happened in the providence of God, that my own health was comparatively, though, alas, as the event proved, only partially and temporarily restored. That being the case, letters reached me from various influential parties, while others called upon me in person, begging and entreating me to reconsider my known resolution, and stating that if I allowed my name to be brought forward the names of others would be withdrawn; thus there would be an end of all unpleasant discussion, and the peace and harmony of the Church would be maintained. This came upon me so staggeringly—opposed as it was to all I had intended, so contrary to all my own wishes, and so subversive of all my plans and purposes—that it took me thoroughly aback, and for a time confounded me as to what was the course of duty. For some time I could not give an answer. At last, as the result of waiting upon the God of providence, of grace, and of prayer, I arrived at this conclusion, that I might so far agree to remain passive, and watch the current of events, and if I found, in point of fact, that the names of other parties would be withdrawn, and that there was anything like a general unanimity—then it would be to me something like the voice of God speaking through his own Church, and calling on me to obey, after I had resisted as long as I could. We have no warrant to expect a

miraculous vision or voice from heaven now ; but I am strongly impressed with an overawing sense of anything like the unanimous opinion or judgment of a body of men constituted, as our Church is, in the name of Christ—such a unanimous judgment solemnly pronounced would seem to come home to me with all the force of a call in Providence, which it would be wrong to resist. (Applause.) Thus the matter stood till the present time, and seeing now, from the intimation you have made to me, that I am called to accept this office, I can only say, that in all earnestness, in all humility, in all sincerity, from the very fullness of my heart, I yield to the call, purely, simply, and entirely, as to me the voice of Providence speaking to me through this Church. (Applause.)

I do enter with my whole heart and soul into the feelings and sentiments which animated the prophet of old when called to discharge his office for the first time : “ Ah, Lord God,” said he, “ behold I cannot speak ; for I am a child.” In other words, I am overwhelmed with a sense of my unfitness, my incompetency, my insufficiency. And such are the burning convictions of my own soul at this moment. I know not what the views of others may be, but, looking at it in its length and breadth, it is not merely impulsiveness that is wanted in such an office as this. For this Chair varied information—reaching through whole centuries, and extending to all lands—is needed, through which the impulse is to be imparted. I feel it is an office that would require a combination of faculties and talent which neither I nor any single man can possess. The lofty and fervid eloquence of a Chalmers, the close logical force and argumentativeness of a Cunningham, and the saintly impressiveness and unction of a Gordon—all would be needed to do such an office anything like justice ; for the theme of it is that which is nearest and dearest to the heart of the Divine Redeemer on the throne on high, and which ought to be nearest and dearest to His people’s heart on earth.

Having said this much, I draw to a close by merely remarking that with my whole heart and soul do I enter into the sentiments expressed by our Moderator in his opening address as to the importance of the missionary element to any branch of the Christian Church—as to its being the element by which to determine a standing or a falling Church. But there is another view of it which has always impressed me—that if all Christian Churches are under obligations to enter upon the missionary work, methinks this Church is pre-eminently under such obligations. I believe it is essentially connected with our distinctive doctrine that the Lord Jesus Christ is not only King and Head of His Church, but also King and Governor among the nations, and Prince of all the kings of the earth. There is no Church on earth that has contended more vehemently than this Church for purity of doctrine for three hundred years ; but I believe that the Scottish Reformed Church, now represented by the Free Church, has exceeded all Churches on earth in contending for this—that Christ is not only King and Head of His Church, but is King and Governor of the nations. I believe this doctrine entered into the very essence of the constitution of the Church at the time of the Reformation, and gave it its peculiarity of character. It was the contest for this doctrine which, in subsequent times, drove so many hundreds and thousands of our best and noblest men to the stake and the scaffold—to the moors and to the mosses, to the dens and to the

caverns of the mountains—and which constrained the scattered few so often to meet in some deep dell under the canopy of heaven, to hear the Word of God “by Cameron thundered or by Renwick poured in gentle stream.” It was the cause and the theme of the ten years’ conflict—of which we rejoice that the historian is still in our midst, to help us with his sagacious counsels and sustain us with the unflagging energy of his faith. This being the doctrine, I have to ask—Are not we as a Church pre-eminently bound to see it carried out into actual practice and actual effect? Are we to be satisfied with allowing it a place as a mere abstract proposition in our standards and creeds, and there to end? The thing would be an absurdity. We are called upon, even on the score of simple honest consistency, to see it carried into practice; and how is this to be done? I ask this question—Do the nations at present obey Him? Do they acknowledge Him as their King? Do they render allegiance to Him as their lawful Sovereign? Why, it looks like a burlesque and a mockery to put such a question. A large proportion of our own nominally Christian people do not acknowledge Him, and the greater portion of the kings and nations of the earth are ignorant of His very existence! How, then, can they do homage to *Him* as their lawful King? And what is His will but that His Church should go forth as a Church militant, conquering and to conquer in His name, subjugating the nations by the gospel and by the sword of His Spirit, so that they may be brought into practical obedience to His authority and law? What is this but another name for missions to the unevangelised world of heathenism? (Applause.) I am, then, only calling upon this Church to act out its own noble and glorious creed, when I ask them to elevate the cause of missions to its true zenith position in the firmament of duty—a position it has never yet occupied in this or any other Church. I implore and entreat that all the members of this House and of this Church will unite in prayer that the event consummated this day may tell in securing this transcendent object—that the appointment to such a Chair as this—whoever may be the party appointed—may, along with other agencies that are now at work, act together, so as to elevate this Church to its true and proper platform and pedestal as a Missionary Church—to raise up this Church of our fathers, this historical Church, to its true height and might, its true glory and grandeur and dignity as an evangeliser of the nations—and thus to exemplify and realise before the whole world the real meaning, the real significance, of its own glorious doctrine, that the Lord Jesus Christ is at once Head and King of His Church as well as King and Governor of the nations. (Applause.) I simply sit down, thanking this Assembly and the whole Church for their unspeakable kindness towards me. I feel from the inmost depths of my soul that it is undeserved. I can only say that, according to the health and strength which may be vouchsafed, in humble dependence upon divine grace, and by the aid and counsel of other friends and colleagues, all will be done which health and strength can admit of being done for the sake of promoting this great and glorious object contemplated by the foundation of this new Chair. And let me then say that whatever infirmities encompass a man, if God be the moving agent, these will be overruled for accomplishing His purpose; His grace will be sufficient, and His strength will be perfected in one’s weakness. And now I am ready to exclaim—“See, Lord, here am I, thine unworthy servant. I am the clay, Thou art the

potter ; mould me, shape me, fashion me as Thou wilt ; breathe upon me, breathe through me, breathe by me ; let me only become the conscious agent in Thy hand of enunciating and expounding Thy will, so that at length the earth may be filled with Thy glory." (Loud applause.)

The Assembly then engaged in prayer, led by the Moderator, on behalf of Dr Duff and the work upon which he has entered.

Before the Court passed to the next business on the programme,

Dr DUFF said there were two points which, from his desire not to trespass unduly on the time and attention of the House, had escaped his memory. In the first place, he desired it to be distinctly understood that he would not appropriate, for his own personal use, one farthing of emolument in connexion with the Chair, but that every farthing of it should be devoted to the missionary institute, which he held to be the inseparable complement of the Chair. It was the only condition upon which he could agree to accept the office—that his services should be purely and absolutely gratuitous. (Applause.) In the second place, he was sure it would be the mind of the Church that the Assembly should place on record their unfeigned and grateful thanks to the noble and generous-minded contributors who had come forward to aid in the establishment of this Chair. (Applause.)

PASTORAL ADDRESS TO THE MINISTERS, OFFICE-BEARERS, AND MEMBERS AT MISSION STATIONS.

An overture from members of the House was read, praying the Assembly to appoint a committee to prepare a draft of a pastoral letter to be issued to ministers, office-bearers, and members of the Church at the various mission stations in India and Africa. Such letters have, by the blessing of God, been very profitable to many of those in the Church at home to whom they have been addressed, and those connected with the missions named, on account of their position in the midst of heathenism, are specially in need of counsel and strengthening from the Supreme Court of the Church, while, on account of their distance, the General Assembly cannot afford them such counsel and strengthening otherwise than by letter addressed to them.

Dr DUFF moved the approval of the overture. He said—On two occasions, once in 1848 and again in 1854, an address was sent by the Foreign Missions Committee to labourers in the foreign mission field. But there has never heretofore been a pastoral address from the General Assembly of this Church to missionaries and others at our foreign mission stations. I need not occupy your time by reminding you that before now pastoral addresses of this kind have been attended with the most beneficial results at home. And if they were so in the case of the churches in this country, how much more are they fitted to give joy and edification and encouragement to those who are labouring in foreign lands. It is impossible—and just now there is no time to speak to you of it—it is impossible for those who have not known it to understand that peculiar feeling of isolation and dreariness which is often experienced by labourers in the foreign field when left all alone by themselves—their ears, it may be, everlastingly stunned with the sounds, and their hearts sickened with the spectacles of a demoralising idolatry and its results. Cut off, as it were, from vivifying contact with the great Christian brotherhood alto-

gether, a feeling of weakness and helplessness is apt to creep into their souls, and tends to paralyse all their energies. It has therefore been strongly felt by the Foreign Missions Committee that a pastoral address from this Assembly would be attended with effects of a most beneficial character. It would tend to make those labouring in foreign climes feel that, separated as they are by distance from the Church at home, we are with them in our sympathies and our prayers. An address of this kind reaching them would be very much like the glow of sunshine and summer after the cold, dark gloom of winter—like a refreshing shower upon the dry parched land—giving refreshment to their feelings, and an impulse to all their energies. Nor would it be less beneficial in its effects upon native labourers, those who have never seen the members of this House, and whom the members of this House, with the exception of a very few, have never seen, and are never likely to see. It would enable them to realise, in a new and unwonted way, what is meant by the catholicity of the Church, by the communion and fellowship of the saints. (Hear, hear.) It would rouse to still greater zeal and still increased exertion, by making them feel that far across the ocean were those who had them upon their hearts at the throne of grace. Moreover, it would be an appropriate following up of the admirable remarks which dropped from the Moderator at the close of his opening address—remarks which, I venture to say, will be found to vibrate across oceans and continents, and occasion a thrill of joy and gladness in the hearts of many a weary and toilworn labourer among the barbarisms of Southern Africa, or the idolatries and superstitions of India. I beg simply to move that this House may be pleased to appoint a special committee to prepare a pastoral address, to be brought up at the last sitting, and, if approved, with or without modification, to be signed by the Moderator, sent out to those connected with our foreign missions. (Applause.)

Dr MURRAY MITCHELL seconded the motion.

It was unanimously agreed to, and a committee named to prepare an address.

REPORT OF FINANCE COMMITTEE.

Mr MELDRUM read the report of the Finance Committee, (No. XII.)

Dr CANDLISH moved the adoption of the report, which was agreed to.

EVENING SEDERUNT.

DEPUTIES FROM AMERICA.

The Assembly called for Commissions to Deputies from the United States of America. A Commission was read from the General Assembly of the Old School Presbyterian Church in America, from which it appeared that Dr M. Judson Hickok and Mr Henry M. MacCracken, minister at Columbus, Ohio, were deputed by that Assembly to visit this Assembly; and that Mr Parke, minister in Pennsylvania, deputed to the United Presbyterian Synod, had now been associated with Dr Hickok and Mr MacCracken in deputation to this Assembly. A Commission was also read from the General Assembly of the Old School Presbyterian Church, from which it appeared that Dr Ezra Eastman Adams, minister at Philadelphia, and Dr H. M. Field, minister at New York, had been then

deputed by that Assembly to represent it in this Assembly. Farther, a Commission was read from the Executive Committee of the Mission in behalf of Freedmen, from which it appeared that they had deputed Mr J. A. Thome, minister at Cleveland, Ohio, to represent this cause to this Assembly, as well as to other religious and ecclesiastical bodies in Great Britain. These brethren were introduced by Dr Candlish, and addressed the Assembly in succession.

Dr HICKOK—Mr Moderator, fathers and brethren, it gives me great pleasure to bear to you the Christian salutations of my brethren and your brethren on the sun-setting shore of this great and wide sea. The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America to the General Assembly of the Free Church of Scotland, greeting. Personally I esteem it the highest honour of my life to be the bearer of a brotherly and confidential message from the great Free Old School Presbyterian Church in the United States to the great Free Church of Scotland. You can have but little sympathy with the feelings of a native American, as he stands, for the first time, on your historic soil. The scenes so familiar to you have blended with all the romance of his boyhood, and shed their sober light upon all the studies of his riper years. We have not ceased to look to you as the mother country, and especially as the mother Church. Your experience has formed our precedents; your ecclesiastical law is our highest authority. We can never approach you, therefore, without something of the veneration of a religious pilgrim for his Oriental shrine. We have scenery as grand, and a civilisation as remarkable as anything to be found in Europe; but they are necessarily new and raw. The golden sunsets of bygone centuries have not yet stained them with the hue of history, nor hallowed many memorable spots with its rosy coronal. But we are making progress. The tramp, tramp of two millions of armed men, as they have swept our broad States through the dark years that are past; the shock of a hundred battles on some of the bloodiest fields that ever immortalised martial valour and heroism, I think have published us to the world. We will become historic if you will give us time. Peace, too, hath her victories, which we more gladly celebrate. All these vast armies have melted to the simple condition of citizens—have been absorbed in the peaceful pursuits of industry. The mighty pageant has faded without a shock or disturbance. But these hundred thousand graves have not yet grown green again. Countless firesides are shadowed with mourning, wailing for the loved and lost who live only on the roll of honour. Our very heroism is new and common. We pay a willing homage to what is old and venerable, hoary with the wisdom of departed centuries. You will excuse us if we express our high gratification at all we have seen and heard. We could wish that the admiration might be mutual. We felt greatly honoured and stimulated last year as one of your distinguished sons occupied a seat on our platform. And while we are enjoying your abundant hospitality, we trust other worthy representatives of your Church are delighting our Assemblies with your suggestions of wisdom, and assurances of fellowship and fraternity. This interchange of Christian courtesy cannot fail to be profitable to us, and, we hope, not hurtful to you. Separated from the older Protestant community by a thousand leagues of ocean, overshadowed still by primeval forests, interpenetrated by a thousand influences of border life, which you cannot understand, we

are in danger of drifting off to new experiments of religious activity, if not from the old landmarks of Protestant theology.

The Old School Presbyterian Church, which I have the honour to represent, adheres to the formulas, walks in the old ways wherein you and your fathers have delighted to go. Ours has been denominated "Scotch Theology," and Scotch Presbyterianism, in distinction from some prized improvements called American Presbyterianism. We do not deny the allegation, but rather glory in it! Not so much because we admire John Knox and his glorious compeers and successors, but because we believe John Knox followed Paul and Paul's Master. We are willing to sit at your feet as our teachers, because we believe you have studied at the feet of the Great Teacher, and drank at

"Siloa's brook that flowed
Fast by the oracle of God."

We hold that all true improvement, whether personal, social, or religious, requires that every new acquisition should be engrafted upon the old stock, after the manner of a living growth, and be made to partake of the root and fatness of all former acquisitions; that the Church, as she spreads her triumphs over the earth, should be living branches of the good old root, and not mere aggregations—dead as the shore sands, or the débris of an avalanche or an earthquake. We desire a living connexion with you, that the old stock may impart its root and fatness to the swift growths three thousand miles away.

Brethren, the circumstances of our field and work are so different from yours that it is difficult to bring them into any comparison, so as to make you understand them. I suppose the United States is at once the most difficult and most hopeful missionary field on the face of the earth. In the first place, we are overwhelmed with the vast increase of numbers. There is no more prophetic fact in all our modern civilisation than the rapidity with which our country is filling with people. All your ships that cross the Atlantic are glutted with emigrants. From the Rhine, the Elbe, and the Baltic, they are coming in every kind of craft that will float over the great seas. And then our vast virgin soil, capable of supporting an immense population, has given a spring to reproduction not exemplified in modern times. As we open our eyes upon the great future bearing down upon us, we are astonished, sometimes discouraged. The steady increase of population for the last half century affords reliable data on which to base our calculations for the future. During that period our population has steadily doubled in a little less than twenty-five years. According to this ratio, our country will contain, in the year 1900, near one hundred millions of souls, and before the end of the next century more than fifteen hundred millions—considerably more than the entire population of the globe. But we do not expect such rapid increase when the whole country shall become densely populated. But look at it from another point of view. Our country contains more than three millions of square miles. Leaving out that broad belt lying east of the Rocky Mountains, called the "Great American Desert,"—though its recently developed mineral resources will probably fast fill it with adventurous people—we have yet remaining an area of more than two million square miles adapted to the highest agricultural improvement. When our whole territory shall become as densely settled as some of the older

states, say Massachusetts, the country will contain nearly three hundred millions. But a large part of the soil is much better than Massachusetts. Its average excellence is fully equal to that of France or Belgium. The same density of population as in Belgium would give us more than six hundred millions as the number which our country is capable of sustaining with entire comfort. And, unless things change, this limit will be reached in one hundred years from this day. You see our difficulty on the score of numbers.

Then the character of this rushing mass of emigrants presents another desperate difficulty. They are ignorant and degraded many of them, the representatives of every creed in religion and crotchet in politics. Their new-found freedom chafes under any restraint, ignores all authority, inspires defiance against God and the government, and sometimes brings them into hostile conflict with both. To mould and Christianise this mighty mass of excited mind is the hardest problem ever imposed upon any Christian Church.

We have another difficulty unknown to you. A large portion of our people live constantly an emigrant life. The streams which people our great West—where mighty states, away beyond the sunset, annually start into life with the vigorous destiny of empires—do not all have their head-springs on this side the Atlantic. Our own people migrate, many of them many times. A gentleman was once introduced upon the platform at one of our anniversaries in New York as “from the far West.” He lived on the western border of Missouri, three hundred miles west of the Mississippi. He began his address by saying that “he did not live in the west, but where they started to go west.” Undoubtedly, there is more emigration from Missouri than from New York. Of course, a large body of our people are constantly living under the rude, unsettled conditions of border life. This state of things is immensely demoralising. The supports of society are removed, the roots of history and tradition are all cut; and most men become loose and coarse by removal. You know how the old Castilian character suffered by being transplanted to Central and South America. The Dutch Protestants who emigrated to South Africa have sunk almost to a level with the Bushmen: even our Pilgrim Fathers, with all the sympathy and aid which they received from the mother country, degenerated for a century. How to save our wide border settlements is our profoundest problem. We are sending missionaries after them—men who are doing the most self-denying and heroic work which the Church anywhere demands of her sons. They mount the utmost wave of emigration; and share the rough hardships of border life; but they are silently laying the foundations of social and religious institutions which will last for all time.

We have another evil, in common with yourselves, which works much greater mischief there than here. We enter this great and difficult missionary field with divided front and divided forces. Besides the different denominations of Christians, of which the great West is the common “stamping ground,” we have six or eight different sections of Presbyterians, planting two or three churches where one would serve the community better than all; maintaining, with sacred funds, as many sets of agents and offices, and in various ways counteracting each other's influence. I take the liberty to think, as I have often said to both branches of our Church, “It is high time this monstrous spectacle was put out of

the light of the sun." Brethren, we ask your help. Your action will have much influence over us. We must come together. Can we mistake the earnest heart-cry of Christianity on all sides of the globe for union and fellowship? The prayer of true piety, as it was of our Lord, must be, "that they all may be one, as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us, that the world may believe that thou hast sent me." You inherit with us the grand old doctrines of the Reformers, and grander old Church system—older than all creeds, yea, than Christianity itself! Both are adapted to the highest uses of evangelism; both have developed a transforming power, in which are hidden the dearest hopes of this fallen world. We have no need to modify our venerable structures of doctrine or discipline, but fill them with the quickening power of a divine life. The holy fire of hotter zeal will burn up the "wood, hay, stubble" of indifference, formality, and prejudice. Though we must yet for a time wear different uniforms, and march in separate battalions, we can tread to the same drum-beat, and bear down in solid column upon the hosts of our Lord's enemies! While our minds, like our watches, will not go just alike—while each believes his own—we may yet rally round a common standard bearing the charmed words, "Jesus only," and charge the ramparts of sin and Satan more effectually than we have ever done before! I think the glow of a higher Christian devotedness would melt into one our main diversities, and though it might not regulate our ecclesiastical watches, it will tell us when the noon has struck, after which there will be no more sunset.

Mr PARKE.—I take it as a privilege to be able to address you for a few moments. I have felt personally an interest in the success of the Free Church of Scotland since its distinct organisation. In the first place, I was educated in an old Scotch Presbyterian Church, to which my father ministered for forty years. In that church I learnt to love the great principles for which not a few of those who sleep in your Old Greyfriars' Churchyard died; and I have understood this Church as embracing and defending the same great principles. Then it happened that I was a student in the Princeton Seminary at the time of the Disruption. I was there when the delegation from the Free Church visited that institution. They spent the Sabbath there, and I learnt the history of your struggles here; and I heard enounced the great principles for which you were contending from the lips—lips that are now sealed in death—of your lamented and beloved Principal Cunningham, and Drs Alexander, Miller, and Hodge all taught us to love you as a Church, and believed that you did right. I felt so then; I feel so now. Within my heart I have not unfrequently wished that the evangelical, truth-loving, devoted men who are connected with an Establishment south of the Tweed would take the same course that you took.

Then there is another fact. It happens that the congregation to which I preach is largely composed of Scotch. Forty or fifty families have been to a large extent educated here. There is a colony that came from a town in what I would call the Alps of southern Scotland, and which is known as Wanlockhead. They have told me that on many a Sabbath they have listened to their old pastor, having no covering over them but the sky, and when the sound of his voice was drowned by the wind and storm around them. Indeed, since I have been here I have been told of

Dr Guthrie preaching there in snow almost up to his knees ; Chalmers preached there, and also the sainted M'Cheyne. I have reason, therefore, to know something about you, and to be interested in your position.

But I believe that the ministers of America and the people generally know a good deal more about you, your history, your struggles, your trials, than you know about us. We have religious or ecclesiastical papers, which I do not see here, that give us all the information in regard to your Church. We read them, and our people generally are informed in regard to what is going on here. I think it is very unfortunate that you do not know as much about us. I believe in my heart that if you had understood the relations fully in which we stood as a Church to the Government of our country and the institutions of our country, that there would have been less bitterness in the controversy between our churches that resulted in a temporary breaking off of our friendly relations. And I say this the more confidently, because my sympathies in all that controversy were with the Free Church. I believe that our Church was excessively Conservative. Personally I so believed then, and I believe now that if we had been less Conservative at that time, there would have been less occasion for our present Radical position.

But I pass from that. Since I have been here I have been asked a good many questions with reference to the Presbyterian Church of the United States. I have heard our Presbyterianism criticised—that is to say, I have been asked why it is that we are not more intensely Presbyterian. I confess that I see among you many things that I like better than what I see at home. But I wish you simply to keep in view why and how it is that we differ from you. I believe the great doctrines of the Westminster Confession are taught in our churches as fully as they are with you. But the Presbyterianism there does differ to some extent from what it is here. There is not that permanency of the pastoral relation with us that there is with you, for one thing—there is not that kind of provision made for our ministers that there is with you. Then, as Dr Hickok has said, you are small comparatively, and we are a vast country, covering almost a continent. Now, Presbyterianism is not like an iron armour that cannot be stretched, yet it possibly does not suit us in all respects as it would suit you ; it is not so easily worked with us as in a small community. The *Great Eastern* takes more men and more money to sail her than a small craft. That is one thing.

Another thing that deserves to have some importance attached to it is, that the growth of your country has been a normal growth—you have been able to provide the means necessary for it in schools and seminaries of a higher kind. We have a vast population pouring in upon us continuously ; they are not a homogeneous body, but people from all parts of the world—Irish, Scotch, English, Welsh, Germans, some Spaniards, and Italians ; also some from China : we have, too, our Indians. I asked and have been told that the population of Scotland is three millions ; but we have more coloured people, freedmen, from whom the shackles of slavery have just been struck off, than you have of people in all Scotland. This is the character of our people ; and it is not easy to work such a body even under the Presbyterian system, which in itself is an admirable one. You are as fully supplied with the means of grace and institutes of learning as any country in Europe. We are differently placed, al-

though, if we had men at command, we could locate five hundred men in less than six months at points where they are needed, if we had the men and the means to support them.

Another consideration is that, wherever you have a town of two thousand or three thousand people, there is such a large Presbyterian element that you can start a church and schools at once—as I believe every Presbyterian Church, to be thoroughly warmed and worked, should have a pastor and a school as well. But can we do that when in localities where we have two thousand or three thousand of a population, many are Roman Catholics, Episcopalians, or connected with other bodies, and perhaps not more than half-a-dozen or a dozen families Presbyterian out of the whole? You can thus see the difficulty of establishing churches and schools where people are not disposed to unite to support them. Still, we believe in the Presbyterian form of Church government, and hope to see the day when our country will be as thoroughly Presbyterian as your country. But it will take time. In the meantime, we are doing the best we can. What we want principally is more men, better men, and better means to sustain the gospel than we have; and above all else, what we want in the American Church is a baptism of the Holy Spirit. That will make us more united—it will give us men to go forth to preach the gospel—it will give us the means. When God's people are baptized with His Spirit, they are ready to give to His cause; that, too, will cure the Church of formality and of ritualism. Learning will not do; nothing but the Spirit of God will do. I trust we shall have your prayers that God will baptize our Church with His Spirit.

Rev. Mr MACCRACKEN next addressed the Assembly. He said,—Moderator,—It was my first thought, in the safe mean between those of the old Assembly going before, and those of other American Churches following upon the roll of the deputation, to enjoy the cushioned seat provided those from a far country, and sit in silence. But the reading of the letter of commendation has introduced me as occupying a position different in a measure from my brethren. It has pleased the stated clerk of our Assembly, the honoured Dr Alexander T. Macgill, professor in Princeton, to name me as representative of the younger ministers and younger men of the Presbyterian body. Will it be wrong, then, if a moment is occupied, if it be only to endorse, in the name of the younger men and ministers of America, what has already been spoken?

It is true that not only young men, but a very young portion of Christianised America, is represented by me. An aged clergyman of the Presbyterian Church in the city where I have laboured, died two or three years since. He was the first minister in that region, and was commissioned not so long ago as 1800, as “missionary to Ohio and the parts adjacent!” And whether in the name of young men or of new Presbyteries of the Church, I would claim peculiar relations to this Free Church of Scotland. The first impressions made upon me when a boy—what ministers much older cannot say—respecting religious effort in Europe, had their source in the fountain newly opened in the country of my fathers. It was in the house of a missionary, upon what was then the frontier. A guest came to the house—always a great event to the children of those living in the midst of the forest, almost unbroken; the more when it was a minister, but far transcending in interest when, as at this time, the guest was one fresh returned from the other side of the

ocean. It may be believed that the children were allowed to sit up far into the night hours. Upon the mind of myself, a mere lad at my father's knee, the stories of the splendours of royal display, and of art and nature, more grand, made deep impress; but of that night's conversation, more lasting than all the rest, was the rehearsal by the young student, of his intercourse with the men of the Free Scottish Church, and of the glowing lessons of truth from your own glorious Chalmers. It becomes me, for the influence thus beginning, and never ceasing, to own to-night, in this great presence, how deep an obligation! Is it strange if the younger men, who have grown contemporaneous with this Church, stand very near to you in respect to all the important questions upon which Christian minds are now concentrating? They rejoice to say that they inscribe upon the banner they bear that which is emblazoned in bright letters upon yours—the word FREE. A few years since we felt they could not, as the Church struggled with slavery a heavy burden; but Providence, not we, has loosed the cords, and now we lift ourselves up—we, the younger men, who hardly knew how, with the load growing upon us, we could ever walk straight, now say that we are free!

A second point in which we, whose lives are measured by your life, trust that we are one, is the desire and effort for the speedy re-uniting of the now sundered fragments of the Presbyterian host. An incident may best illustrate how it is with the younger American ministers. Last year, at the Synod of New York, I had the pleasure of meeting four of my fellow-students of whom I had lost sight. Naturally there were many inquiries exchanged regarding our labours. I asked one, "Brother A, What Church have you?" "Oh, I have the New School Church of M." "What is yours?" I said to B. "Mine is the Church of the New School at N." And so it was with Brother C and D. Every one of the four, brought up at the feet of Dr Hodge, "after the strictest sect," if you please, was in charge of a congregation of "the other branch." Is it marvellous if the young men, whose position this fairly illustrates, are anxious for organic and immediate union?

In a third point we would stand with you. In this afternoon's session an eloquent speaker, whose praise is in all the Churches—I mean him whom you have elected missionary professor, Dr Duff—was emphatic in his expression that faith in prayer was the great power, that as it had been proven in the foundation of this professorship, in some respects so extraordinary, it would be in the world's awakening. This we would make our sentiment; but there is another expression of what we believe concerning this that is stronger than anything I can utter. One of the young business men of a city of Illinois is in this Assembly to-night, who for seven or eight weeks past has engaged himself, with others in London, to establish in Aldersgate Street a "business men's daily prayer meeting." I heard it announced yesterday week by Mr Spurgeon, that the meeting was in progress, and would be conducted by himself at noon the next day. Attending the Fulton Street meeting of New York city, a few days before sailing, there was observable no decrease of life in that service of nearly ten years' standing. But it is said that already this London noon-day meeting affords signs of prosperity that place it before every other. It is faith in prayer that is the minister's and the Christian's power. The church in which I last worshipped in America was that of the late Dr Murray, or "Kirwan." There prayer meetings were

held daily, and, at that one, about one hundred persons remained to ask the petitions of Christian people. There were old men, men of middle age, those in prominent positions in life, with the young and strong, all bowing in answer to intercession. Thus faith in prayer is the arm of our power.

In the French anniversaries it was said by the eminent Professor of Theology at Lausanne, as he spoke of the evangelisation of Paris, "The power of the Reformed Church, in her years of struggle, was in the fact that the burghers of the south and the nobles of the capital alike stood up and said, squarely, 'I believe.'" It seemed to me, as I heard the expressions of our brethren there, that in their separation within a year past from the Rationalistic party, and their call for a General Assembly, such as they have not had since Louis XIV., they too are rallying to the good fight of faith. As I looked upon "The Battle of Ivry," a noble picture at Versailles, it was to me a picture of the Christians of that apostate empire. When Henry of Navarre rode into that battle he charged his followers, when they lost sight of all else, to rally to the place where they saw his shining helmet.

" Press where ye see my white plume shine
Amid the ranks of war,
And be your oriflamme to-day,
The helmet of Navarre!"

So Jesus is calling, and those French Christians are answering and gathering in humble trust around our blest Captain! So are we anxious to be one with you, in this thing above all others, for forms and political beliefs are trifles comparatively; in one thing, faith in prayer for the triumph of Jesus! "We believe that Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God," "Whom He hath appointed heir of all things;" and that as we go forth discipling all nations, Thou "wilt be with us alway, even unto the end of the world." So let it be!

Dr ADAMS.—Moderator and brethren of the Free Church Assembly, although it has been my privilege to have spent thirteen years in Europe, two of them in England, Ireland, and Wales, visiting those sections somewhat extensively, I had not the happiness, until last Thursday, of stepping on the soil of your country. I am happy now to find myself in Scotland—the land of glorious mountains and lovely lakes—land of schools and knowledge, where the ploughboy emerges into poetic fame, and he who hammers the "Old Red Sandstone" may trace in it the "Footprints of the Creator"—land of song, coming to our ear in the wild notes of Ossian, and in the gentle music of Robert Burns and Allan Ramsay—land of metaphysics and argument, whose logic lightning has flashed across the Atlantic—land of pulpit orators whose words have wakened echoes in the New World—land of the Catechism and the Bible, at whose ingle-sides families gather in the morning and the evening hour, "then kneeling down to heaven's eternal King, the saint, the father, and the husband prays"—land of heroes and patriots who shed their blood for Home, and Country, and Kirk—land which at this day illustrates the grandeur of Christian sacrifice and the majesty of true faith. I am happy, sir, to appear before you as one of the deputies to bring you greeting from the Presbyterian New School Free Church in America. I say, *free*; and I think we have a claim to this appellation, for we were delivered from the burden and the curse of slavery *before*

our honoured brethren of the other branch had the power or the courage to achieve their emancipation. When I entered Philadelphia about nine years ago, having gone thither for my health, I was drawn into the New School relation, mainly because of its exemption from the great national sin. I had no objection to the Old School doctrines, rather am I claimed to be on the side of the Old School because of my religious views. The body which we represent is not small. Although not quite so large as the other branch, it numbers about 1700 churches and as many ministers, and we have not far from 120,000 communicants. We operate in our Christian work as you do, through the agency of the Assembly's Boards—namely, Foreign Missions, Home Missions, Publication, Education, Church Erection, and Ministerial Aid. Our Board of Foreign Missions is in harmony with the American Board of Commission for Foreign Missions, yet we feel deeply the need of independent action, whereby the 100,000 dols. contributed by our churches annually may be expended more in harmony with our own views of Church organisation. When the two branches of our great family shall unite again, we can easily fall into the already existing agency for foreign missions.

Two years ago, our Board of Publication, which is doing a great and increasing work, secured 50,000 dols. as a permanent fund, enabling us to donate printed matter to Sabbath schools and churches which are too poor to purchase. You will readily see, from the words of Dr Hickok with regard to the extent of our territory and the increase of our population, which amounts to not less than 1,500,000 annually, that the *Home Mission* is our greatest work. To this we contribute about 100,000 dols., sustaining missions and schools in fourteen of the States. We have no occasion for regretting our peaceful separation from the American Home Missionary Society, and putting forth our denominational energy in our own way. Much of our home mission work is among the freedmen, and yet we contribute largely, as a body, to other associations for the benefit of this class. And you will be gratified to know that in this field of Christian effort the results are greater than we could have predicted. Multitudes of the coloured race in our country are too old and too confirmed in the habits of ignorance ever to be greatly elevated; but there are more than *a million* between the ages of *five* and *fifteen* years. These, with many much older, are full of promise. Already 200,000 have learned to read and write since the Act of Emancipation. There are now in Florida one hundred schools for them, some supported by their own contributions. In Georgia there are one hundred and fifty schools; and many in most of the other once rebel States. One of the most interesting and hopeful features, in relation to the freedmen, is their intense desire for knowledge. Let them remain free, and they *will be educated*, whether we aid them or not. It is my privilege and honour to be connected, as a trustee, with the Lincoln University, Oxford, Pennsylvania, in which *one hundred young men of colour* are prosecuting their education, *sixty* of them studying for the Christian ministry. When they graduate they go South, some to preach, others to teach among their own people. I was informed by the president of this institution, that the pupils are so earnest in the pursuit of knowledge, as to commence their studies at three o'clock in the morning, and continue without intermission, except for meals and exercise, until ten at night; and that he had not been called to rebuke any of them for im-

propriety from the beginning to the end of the year. An instance is related of John Green, once a slave, and afterwards employed by one of our chaplains in the army. One morning John arose early to prepare the fire for his master, while the latter remained in bed. He had often taught John, and now listened to him in dialogue with himself, and unconscious of his master's notice. He had kindled the fire, and by the light of it, endeavoured to read this sentence, "Thou, God, seest me." He began to spell the first word, "T—h—o—u." "John Green," said he to himself, "what is that? what did master say that was?" Looking and hesitating, he at last uttered, "Thou." "John Green, you have it." Thus he spelled and pronounced, stumbling considerably at "seest," but finally deciphering the whole, and reading it, "Thou—God—seest—me!" Then, stretching up to his full height, he exclaimed, "John Green, you have it; John Green, you can read; John Green, you're a man!" Was not that like the birth of a soul? the springing of an immortal mind into inward freedom? Can anything be more sublime in the history of humanity?

It ought to be stated, that in proportion as the freedmen are educated, they demand a more solid discipline, and tend to a more scriptural view of truth. They have been wont to consider themselves Methodists, and taught that religion consists in violent emotion and demonstration; but as they grow in knowledge another element of their nature reveals itself. They discover something within their minds deeper than mere feeling. They can think and reason. They feel the need of cultivating the more solid part of their intellectual being, and that culture leads them to a more stable and profound view of doctrinal truth. They are tending surely to Presbyterianism. They have learned, by their sufferings, to trust in God, and they believe in His sovereignty. Those who are educated in the Catechism see its harmony and truth, and their *mental* as well as moral tone is thereby settled and sustained.

Perhaps I ought to say a word about the union of our two branches in America. I am happy to hear the words of Dr Hickok. I endorse all that he said, and more. There is no good reason for the continued separation of our two denominations. We all take the "Confession of Faith" as our standard. The spirit of heresy-hunting lingers in the breasts of only a few good old men; the vast majority of our laymen regard the difference as an old quarrel of ministers, and feel that it ought to be forgotten. The question is often asked, What is the distinction between the Old School and the New in point of doctrine? I know of no better answer than this, The Old School believe that all men *sinned in Adam*; and the New School, that *in Adam all sinned!* Were you to divide the Old School into two parties, you would find the half of them as *low* in doctrine as most of the New School; and were you thus to divide the New School, you would find the half of them as *high* in doctrine as the most of the Old School. Everything that has divided us is passing, and will soon be gone. The committees appointed by the two Assemblies have already, as the telegraph informs us, agreed on the basis of re-union. The terms are—assent to the standards. It will not be long before our Boards and property can be adjusted, we fervently hope; and then we shall have a denomination of 4000 churches, as many ministers of the gospel, and 300,000 members. But there is a *better* union than that of mere denominations. The spokes of a wheel are very

near each other at the centre of motion, but more remote at the circumference. As Christians approach Christ, the source and centre of their life and action, they approach one another; and it is sometimes best that they be more removed where they touch the world—their influence is more broad. The ocean is a grand unity, and yet how it adapts itself to its condition, yielding to the jutting promontory, sweeping up into bays, and rising into creeks. How it roars around the Orkneys, as with true Presbyterian thunder; foams and grows fervid in the Caribbean, as if it were an emblem of a hot Methodist camp-meeting; and plays gently along the Pacific shore, with all the order and repose of an *Establishment!*

Why cannot all Presbyterians unite, in this day of ritualism and semi-infidelity, in some grand plan of Christian work? Let the venerable Dr Duff and our excellent Dr Thomson select a grand field for us, to summon the Presbyterians of Scotland, and Ireland, and England, of France, and Geneva, and America, to the work; and let our treasure, and zeal, and prayers, and labours be so applied, that we may save some continent from darkness and death. Sir, I repeat my feelings of deep satisfaction in this hour. I shall carry through life the memory of it. God bless the Free Church of Scotland!

Rev. Dr FIELD was next introduced, and spoke as follows:—

Moderator, fathers and brethren, it is pleasant to be the bearer of good tidings—to cross the sea with a message not of war but of peace—to carry kind greetings from land to land. It is pleasant, in stepping on a foreign shore, to hear a voice of welcome, and to grasp the outstretched hand of a brother. That welcome we find given to us, coming here as the representatives of a people and a Church kindred to your own. It is the first time that delegates from the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America have appeared in an Assembly of the Free Church of Scotland. It seems strange, now that we are becoming better acquainted, that we have stood apart so long, and that this should be the first interchange of Christian courtesies between two branches of the great Presbyterian family on opposite sides of the ocean. May it prove the beginning of an intercourse that shall grow more intimate with years, thus binding in closer union the scattered members, not only of the Presbyterian household, but of that great family which is named in heaven!

Coming to Scotland, an American does not feel himself a stranger. It is a part of that kingdom from which we derive our ancestry. If he cannot say, “My foot is on my native heath,” he does feel that he is among not unfamiliar scenes. In the very aspect of the country there is much to remind us of our own. That portion of the American Union lying to the north, bordering on Canada, is a broken country of hills and valleys, where rugged peaks shoot upwards to the clouds, their sides covered with dark pine forests; and torrents leap down the rocky gorges, and sweep onwards to the vales below—scenes that often remind the wandering Scot of—

“The land of the mountain and the flood.”

Parts of it are as wild and desolate as any portion of your own Highlands—so bleak, indeed, that it is sometimes said that “nothing will grow there but men!” But men grow, like trees out of the cleft of the rock, showing the tenacity, the hardihood, and the strength of that wintry

clime. And that country, so wild and bleak, is, like your own Grampian Hills, the very eagle nest of liberty. Other portions of New England are of less rugged aspect; more fertile soil, and denser population. The scenery changes much as with you, where your Highlands sink into the Lowlands. So there, where the bold northern peaks sink into gentler slopes, you may see a goodly land with every sign of abundance; the cattle upon a thousand hills; hundreds of peaceful villages, with the church spires gleaming among the trees, and the school-house hard by. Among those hills and valleys dwells a people not unlike your own. If you were to enter those homes, you would find the same domestic scenes described in Burns' "Cotter's Saturday Night"—the same tender love and household piety.

And not only is the scenery of Scotland familiar, but its history and its literature. Its history—from the days of Wallace and Bruce—we know it all by heart. And your great writers—we have all wept over the "Lights and Shadows of Scottish Life;" we have felt the charm given to your annals by the genius of your great novelist; and the songs of Scotland are sung by the hearthstones of America. I do not think it an over-refinement, or forced comparison, to say that there is a great resemblance between the Scotch and American mind—especially the New England mind. In both there is a fondness for metaphysical discussion, strangely united with a practical shrewdness and sagacity. Hence the Scotch writers on mental philosophy are as much read in America as at home. They furnish the text-books for our colleges. We acknowledge our obligations to the thinkers, the philosophers, and the theologians of Scotland—to your Reids, and Browns, and Dugald Stewarts, and Sir William Hamiltons—as well as to your Chalmers, and to the giants of the latter time. But these obligations are not all on one side. You too are under obligations to us. More than a century ago, in the little village where I was born, lived a humble missionary to the Indians. There, in the stillness of that quiet village, under the shadow of those hills, he wrote theological and philosophical treatises, which led Robert Hall to pronounce Jonathan Edwards, as a master of reasoning, "the greatest of the sons of men," and caused his works to be quoted as the highest authority by Chalmers himself in this city of Edinburgh. These great thinkers and writers—the masters of thought and of song—have established a tie between us that draws Americans to Scotland more than to almost any other country in Europe, even than to England itself. And it is a happy reflection that, in the late wonderful triumph of human genius and skill which brings the Old World and the New into instantaneous communication, it was an eminent professor in the University of Glasgow—Sir William Thomson—that furnished the science for that marvellous achievement; and a Scotch commander, Sir James Anderson, one of the noblest sons of Scotland, that led the "Great Eastern" safely across the deep.

But we appear before you, not merely as Americans, but as Presbyterians; and it is as such that we feel the ties drawn still closer which bind us to Scotland. We are of the same faith and order, and our Presbyterian polity is derived from yours. Scotch ministers first planted Presbyterianism on the other side of the Atlantic. In the excellent "History of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America," by my friend Rev. Dr. Gillett, of New York, you may trace the full history of that emigrant Presbyterianism which has flowed from Scotland to America

for a hundred years. Your country has furnished a large number of the ministers in our pulpits, and of the elders in our churches. Dr John Witherspoon, a distinguished Presbyterian minister, was one of the signers of the Declaration of Independence, and afterwards President of the College of New Jersey—thus serving his country alike in war and in peace. So the Scotch have been always among the most patriotic as well as the most religious part of our population. In the late war, Highland regiments fought in our battles. Standing here to-day, I thank the land that, in a great struggle for liberty, mingled its heroic dead with ours.

I have said, we who are Presbyterians claim a nearer kindred with Scotland by reason of our church order and faith. And yet we in America are not Scotch Presbyterians—for the best of all reasons, that we are not Scotchmen. We are Americans, and our ecclesiastical as well as our political institutions derive their complexion from certain peculiarities of our country and of our national life. We are not children of Scotland alone, nor of England, but of Germany and other portions of the Continent. We owe much to your bold reformer John Knox, but still more to his teacher and ours, that great man who taught him on the shores of the Lake of Geneva, John Calvin. Thus our Protestantism, and our Presbyterianism also, is derived from Switzerland as well as from Scotland. We are the spiritual descendants, not only of the Scotch Covenanters, but of the Swiss Calvinists, and of the French Huguenots, and of the Reformed Churches of Holland and Germany. This diverse origin has given us somewhat of a composite character. Besides, some of our people are vain enough to think that our religious as well as political institutions derive a peculiar stamp from the vastness of our country itself; that as our rivers are longer, and our lakes broader, than those of other countries, so there is a corresponding largeness in the ideas of the people:—

“No pent up Utica contracts our powers,
But the whole boundless continent is ours.”

This is a very pretty fancy to tickle the vanity of our people, who are given to boasting. But this we may say, in all simplicity, that in a country of such vast extent, where the work to be done is so great, and where population comes pouring in from all parts of the world, we should be wanting in even ordinary sagacity, as well as nobleness, if we did not learn some degree of charity and liberality; if we did not forget the petty rivalries of sect in the magnitude of the interests committed to our care. In this view, the greatness of our country may conduce somewhat to a true Christian magnanimity.

The Church which I have the honour to represent is not the only Church in America, nor even the only Presbyterian Church, but it is a large and influential Christian body. It comprises about 1700 churches and an equal number of ministers, 120,000 church members, and in its congregations not less than half a million of souls. It is not the church of New England (though a large part of both its ministers and its members come from New England), nor does it extend much into the Southern States. Its field is chiefly in the great middle States of New York and Pennsylvania, and so on to Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois. Thus it stretches in one broad belt or zone half way across the continent from the Atlantic to the Mississippi. In this wide field it comprises an amount of piety, learning, and general intelligence—as shown not only by its churches, but its schools, and colleges, and seminaries, and all the means

of influence over the national mind and heart—not inferior to that possessed by any other in the republic.

You are aware that the Presbyterian Church in the United States is divided into two bodies. The division took place nearly thirty years ago, in 1838. There were many causes for this—some theological differences, but not sufficient to produce separation without some more active and personal influences. Such were found in certain differences of organisation—the question of Church boards as against Voluntary Societies, and a question of abrogating a plan of union which had existed for a generation between the Presbyterian and Congregational Churches in the new States of the West. But that which has been the great troubler of our Church, as of our nation, has been the question of slavery. The New School, as they were called, were thought to be radical and extreme in their opposition to slavery. Their bold and repeated testimonies gave great offence to the churches of the South, which, in the division, adhered almost in a body to the Old School. This ground of separation could not be removed so long as slavery continued to exist. But how to remove it has been the great problem which has exercised all the political wisdom and all the practical Christianity of our country for many years. It might not have been solved in a generation except by war. The knot has been cut by the sword. God has led us through a Red Sea of blood, and the last vestige of slavery is swept away for ever.

Thus the causes of separation being removed in the course of divine providence, it is natural that the question should return of reunion between the two branches of the Presbyterian Church in America. Within the last two or three years there has been a growing tendency towards union. We have fought so long against secession in the state, that the very name of disunion has become hateful to patriotic ears. Last year the General Assemblies of the two bodies appointed committees of conference to consider terms of union. These committees met in New York two or three months since, and continued in session several days, holding frequent conferences with each other. The impression was one of mutual satisfaction. Doubts and suspicions and distrust, wherever they lingered in any minds, were swept away, and they felt that they were indeed one in Christ Jesus. But the practical difficulties of union were not so easily removed, and required longer deliberation, so that after a full and free statement of all points in difference, they adjourned to meet again in New York on the 1st of May. That conference, as I learn since arriving in Edinburgh, have reported a basis of union. That report will be presented to the General Assemblies now in session, and the precise attitude of both bodies will be learned by your delegates now in America. I can only say in general that the result is doubtful, and it is even a question whether the union is desirable. Each body is very large: the two together might be unwieldy. Then there are many practical difficulties, apart from any theological difference. There is even a very troublesome question of property held in institutions of learning and theological seminaries. All this may delay union for years, or even postpone it altogether. But this much, at least, is secured—the alienation and strife of former years is passed away. Ephraim shall no more vex Judah, nor Judah Ephraim. There is peace upon Israel.

But you can hardly expect an American to appear in an Assembly like this without some allusion to the state of his country. Out of the heart

the mouth speaketh, and if there be any subject of which every true American heart is full, it is his country. Especially when far away, his heart turns to it as that of the ancient Jew turned to Jerusalem. Within the last few years we have had a new experience. Other countries have had their civil wars. Rome had its civil wars. France has been torn by factions; England by the wars of rival houses lasting for generations. But that New World beyond the sea seemed a virgin continent consecrated to liberty and to peace. Yet we have been plunged into the most terrible civil war known in history. That war lasted four years; it raged over half a continent, and brought into the field not less than a million and a half of men. The result has been endless bloodshed and suffering. The whole land was in mourning. At a time it seemed as if there was not a house in which there was not one dead. Yet the nation faltered not. The merits of that controversy were little understood abroad, and hence we found coldness where we expected sympathy. Men said we fought for empire, that we were possessed with a mad ambition and insatiable lust for power, and many declared aloud their joy to see a nation so proud and overbearing thus early broken down. But, sir, we fought for national existence against what must have ended in universal anarchy, or governments like those of Mexico and South America. We fought for liberty against the attempt to found an empire upon slavery. That was a religious war. Men consecrated themselves to it as to a divine service. Churches were broken up by the number of young men that entered the army; Sunday schools were stripped of their teachers. When the battle went sore against us, men fled for refuge to the horns of the altar, and went back from the communion table to the bloody field.

The effect of such a war upon the national character must be very great. We have matured rapidly. It has been common to speak of America as a young nation. That epithet can no longer be applied to us. "We have been young, but now are old." The change has been almost as rapid as with those "whose hairs grow white in a single night." In four years we have lived a century. From having a sort of remote colonial existence, away in the backwoods of America, beyond the limits of civilization, our country has, at a single bound, stepped into the front rank of the nations of the earth. The effect of all this, I confess, is dangerous. Our country has learned the secret of its own power. It has got a taste of war. Fearing nothing from external enemies, our only danger is from within; hence our only hope for our country is in the universal prevalence of education and religion.

I am often asked if we are not disposed to oppress the people of the South. On the contrary, I contend that there is not an example in history of a war so terrible in its character and so tremendous in its proportions, yet ending with less of vengeance. Not a single individual has suffered for treason. One wretched man—a jailer, convicted of having murdered hundreds of prisoners by cruelty and starvation—(thank God, he was not an American)—has suffered the just penalty of his crimes upon the scaffold: and the assassins of Mr Lincoln were tried and executed for murder. But for treason no man has suffered death. Only a few days ago, Jefferson Davis, the very head and front of the rebellion, was suffered to go free. Our Government, that had his life in its hands, did not touch a hair of his head. Pardon me if I recall this unexampled

magnanimity and mercy—at this moment when the great English Government, ruling an empire on which the sun never sets, feels it necessary to send a miserable Irishman* to the scaffold, concerned in an insurrection that did not rise even to the dignity of a mob—and reflect, with satisfaction, that my country, after the most terrible civil war known in history, has not stained its triumph by one drop of blood. (Hisses from the gallery.—Dr Field, turning coolly to that part of the hall from which they came, said, Is this the city of John Knox, the intrepid Reformer, who feared not the face of man? I thought it was a city where they loved a little frankness of speech. During the last five years we have had to bear with a great deal of plain talk from this side of the ocean; and I think that a single manly word may be borne from an American.—Applause.) Towards the people of the South there is no feeling of unkindness whatever. On the contrary, we would bind up their wounds. We have contributed freely in the Northern cities to send bread to them when famishing. But one thing we do desire—that the fruits of this long war shall not be lost. We do not wish to see slavery creeping back into the Union under another name. We wish to see the last vestige of it rooted out of American soil, that it may not spring up to curse our children. That accomplished, we hope to build up a great, free, and Christian commonwealth that shall endure to all generations. In the blessings of that government we wish our brethren of the South to share. The war is ended: and they are no longer enemies, but countrymen and brothers, and our prayer is, that we may henceforth dwell together as brethren; thus foreshadowing that final union of all the good, when “they shall come from the north and from the south, and shall sit down together in the kingdom of God.”

But I must not prolong the words of salutation. I bring you the greetings of your own kindred beyond the sea. And if the hearts of your absent children yearn towards the “auld countrie,” it is pleasant to know that they are not forgotten here. In your prosperity we too will rejoice. Some of our American writers, boasting of our country as in the freshness and vigour of youth, are apt to reflect upon other nations as in old age and decay; but I find that the heart of dear old Scotland is still young. Nations that feed upon knowledge and virtue, that cherish education and religion, do not die. They are like the goodly cedars of Lebanon, that flourish for thousands of years. So in Scotland I find all the elements of life. Her schools and universities are as flourishing as ever. And Jesus Christ dwells in the “hill country.” Said an ancient Roman, “Where liberty is, there is my country.” So wherever Christ dwells, there is my home, whether it be among the Highlands of Scotland, or the granite hills of New England. “Whosoever doeth the will of God”—of whatever race or clime—“the same is my brother, and sister, and mother.”

Rev. Mr THOME said that he was the son of a Scotch father and of a Scotch mother, and although he was born in America, he felt as if he were treading the soil of his fatherland. He was not commissioned to bring greetings from any American Church, but appeared as the representative of the poor and down-trodden freedmen of America, whose entreaties and cries would, he hoped, enter into their ears. He knew that the people of Scotland would love to hear about that people who

* The Fenian Burke was then lying in Dublin Jail under sentence of death.

had suffered so many wrongs when subjected to slavery, but whose chains were now broken off, and who, as freedmen, were beginning to be installed among the citizens of their free republic. He must express his indebtedness to his brethren who had preceded him for the help which they had rendered to the cause he represented by the remarks that had fallen from them. He had been sent by the American Missionary Association, which body was represented in the Assembly last year by Dr Patton and Rev. Sella Martin ; and he had been commissioned to present their acknowledgments for the kind attention which the Assembly had been pleased to give to their case, and for the cordial manner in which they had commended it to the sympathy and liberality of their congregations. He might tell the Assembly that this body were expending amongst the freedmen about a third of a million of dollars. They formerly sent to the freedmen nearly 400 teachers, but during the present year their operations had increased so that now their teachers numbered nearly 500, and the pupils were about 40,000. At 150 points there were missions and education work being carried on. But they could not raise the amount of money necessary to meet the expenditure. They were indebted to the churches and to many people in Great Britain for what they had already given ; and it was his commission to the Free Assembly of Scotland to express the great sense they had in America of the assistance they had given to this work, unprecedented in its greatness, of evangelisation in the South. They would readily perceive the great need there was for effort, when he told them that there were needed 20,000 teachers to meet the demands of their labours in educating these four millions of people who had been set free, and that of these 20,000 teachers not more than 2000 were as yet in the field. The American Missionary Association, for the purpose of promoting education among the black people, could not furnish a number of teachers sufficient to meet the great demand. The Government of the United States were perfectly willing, and were assisting in their work, and he called upon the Clerk (Sir Henry Moncreiff) to read a communication from Major-General O. O. Howard, a Christian man, who had entered the war in the cause of liberty, where he had lost his arm, and who had now devoted the remnant of himself to this great work.

The communication having been read, Mr Thome said that it referred, in the first place, to what the Government had already done and was still doing ; of course, what the Government could do was limited by the nature of its functions. But the communication from General Howard set forth what humane and benevolent institutions were ready to do, and were at present doing in America ; and also what the American Freedmen's Association were doing. He might add, besides General Howard, the names of Chief-Justice Chase and of Senator Sumner from Massachusetts, and other members of the Government, who were all of one opinion, that it was not possible for America alone to meet the great demands of this work ; but that, if they would carry it on, they must receive assistance from friends from abroad. They might possibly say, "We heard this case a year ago, and commended it to our churches, and we do not think we can do any more than we have done." He hoped that such would not be the view of the case they would take, but that they would commend it again to the liberality of the Church. Europe, and England and Scotland especially, had contributed largely

by their moral power to the removal of slavery and to the liberation of the slave from his bonds, and he now only asked them that they should aid the American Society in this last work. Mr Thome concluded by invoking the blessing of God upon the deliberations of the Assembly.

Dr CANDLISH said, I should be sorry to detain the House with any lengthened statement. I do not propose any formal deliverance at this stage. I believe the better plan would be to frame a minute or a formal deliverance at a future diet in answer to these addresses, and that in the meantime we should content ourselves by asking the Moderator to express, in a general way, the extreme satisfaction with which we have received the deputation from America. We may now take for granted that the Old and New School Presbyterians sail in the same boat, and we would welcome and acknowledge them in the same terms. We had last year a deputation from the Old School Presbyterians, and we do rejoice most heartily in hearing this important deputation from the New School, and to be informed already that these two bodies have framed a satisfactory basis of union. I think we must rejoice in this, as healing the breach we have lamented for many years, and as opening up the prospect of a large and generous effort throughout the whole continent of North America. There is only one of the brethren we expected to have heard who has not appeared—Mr A. R. Van Nest, as representing the Reformed Dutch Church. It appears that he cannot be in town till the end of this week, if at all; but I hope that if he does appear we may find some corner—some quarter of an hour, for him—though it may be with great difficulty, in which we might hear him before the Assembly closes. We have heard all the brethren who have commissions from the two Presbyterian Churches, and the brother who last addressed us, who is representing the Society for Promoting the Spiritual Interests of the Freedmen in America.

I cannot but express the exceeding delight with which we now resume intimate relations with the American Churches. It was a deep grief to me when, some years ago, that friendly intercourse was interrupted, in so far as one branch of the Presbyterian Church in America was concerned, all the more because I was instrumental in the writing of those letters which caused the correspondence to be discontinued. The point turned upon slavery, that curse which, wherever it exists, destroys all human feelings, and almost all Christian sympathies. We have reason now to bless God that there is now no such obstacle to the continuance of the most intimate relations with that branch of the Presbyterian Church with which our intercourse was thus interrupted, and that we now see our way to a large and friendly intercourse with the other branch of the Christian Church there.

I was most deeply impressed with the addresses of the brethren who this night spoke to us. They have brought to my mind a much deeper feeling than I ever entertained of the responsibility laid upon them and laid upon us. I think they have made out a case, which shows that they are there in America not only doing the work of the Lord, but are called to face a vast problem—a problem far greater than ever was submitted to a Christian Church—the problem of overtaking a population rapidly increasing at a rate altogether unprecedented—and I feel confident that the more the Christian Churches in this country are brought to consider this matter, the more they will feel that this is a problem which the

American Churches ought not to be left to solve alone. I feel confident, therefore, that the more the state of matters is brought before us, and known and considered and weighed by Christians, the more they will give the American Churches their prayers, their efforts, and their liberalities on their behalf. I suppose that the position in which the American Churches are now placed is unprecedented in the history of Christianity. They have a work set before them never set before any branch of the Church, and have, therefore, a strong claim upon the sympathies, aid, and prayers of the Church of Christ, to meet the unprecedented emergency.

I would say one word in reference to the address of our brother who represents the Freedmen; that is to say, those who were but yesterday slaves. I do not go back—as one of the brethren was disposed to do who addressed us,—I do not enter into the merits and demerits of the war—I do not undertake to defend the position which was taken up by our country and by the Churches in our country during the war. I would just beg liberty to say, that at the commencement, there appeared to be about as much misunderstanding as to the real object of the war across the Atlantic as there was on this side. I beg to assure our brethren that the sympathies of our churches in this country, and of the country generally, were warmly with the prospects of the issue of the war, when it went to the entire extinction of slavery. I thoroughly agree with our brother who said that some responsibility lies upon us in connection with the previous existence of that curse which has been swept away; I thoroughly agree with him in the opinion, that an obligation lies upon us to assist our American friends in every effort they make to ameliorate the condition of the slaves who have been emancipated, and to bring them into a position to prepare them to take the place of free citizens in a free republic. I feel that, as regards the Southern States of America, the churches and societies in the North cannot look for much assistance from them. I fancy that I am right in saying that the responsibility of educating the black people of the South depends to a large extent upon the North, and therefore I am quite willing that the General Assembly should make the strongest recommendation in connection with this Society, reserving at present the framing of a formal deliverance and resolution, such as we should like to be read across the Atlantic, which certainly my speech is not likely to be. I beg, therefore, to move that the Moderator be requested to express our thanks to the brethren who have addressed us.

Colonel DAVIDSON said that when Dr Candlish was speaking on the vast problem which the Churches in America had to solve, he was reminded of the vast problem which this country had to solve in regard to the millions of heathen who form our fellow-subjects in India. There was a vast problem which we had to solve, a problem which belonged to the Church of Christ throughout the world, and when they looked to the Churches of America to give assistance in solving this problem, what was their response, they sent to our British possessions in India a band of noble missionaries. They had sent forth these missionaries, and he had lived among them and had witnessed their labours, and he could testify to the exertions of these noble men in our mission-field of India, and to the success of their labours.

Mr WALKER, Carnwath, expressed the very warm interest he had

taken in the great conflict in which the American people had been recently engaged, and heartily rejoiced in the issue of the war. He referred to the state of the black people in the Southern States, and to the thirst for knowledge they had shown, and concluded by seconding the motion proposed by Dr Candlish.

The MODERATOR (addressing the deputation) said,—Dear brethren—In expressing to you the interest and the pleasure with which we have listened to your addresses, I take the opportunity of saying that, when I heard the other day that we were to be favoured with a deputation from the American Churches, it occurred to me that it might not have been an unwise thing on the part of the General Assembly, in the exercise of its *nobile officium*, to have appointed Dr Guthrie as my substitute for the occasion, in order that he might have addressed to you one of those heart-stirring orations, those “unspoken speeches,” with which, no doubt, he was prepared to carry captive the hearts of the people of America ; but I comfort myself with this, that neither Dr Guthrie nor any other man could exceed me in the respect I entertain for the American people, and more especially in the affectionate regard which I cherish for the ministers and members of the American Churches. Allow me to say, that I do sincerely hope that the people of America do not form their estimate of the opinions and feelings that are entertained towards them in this country from a certain portion of the British press. I will venture to say there are no truer exponents of the feelings that are cherished in the two countries towards each other than the churches of these countries ; and I will add that, if the voice of the Churches is listened to, certain I am of this, that the only feeling, at least the supreme feeling subsisting between the two countries, will be one of the most affectionate confidence and regard, and that the only rivalry that will ever be between them will be that which shall outdo the other in works of benevolence and the advancement of the cause of truth and righteousness.

And now, brethren, with all deference for what fell from my friend Dr Candlish, allow me to say that at least we followed with the most intense interest and concern the progress and the issues of the tremendous conflict in which you were so recently engaged—a conflict that, like everything American, bore the stamp of vast resources and of indomitable energy. We have sympathised with you, and do sympathise, under the great difficulties connected with the vast work of your reconstruction ; and now we rejoice, above all, in the great efforts that have been put forth by the American Churches, and in the weighty influence exercised by you. With respect to the freedmen, we hold as a Church, in common with yourselves, that God has made of one blood all nations of men to dwell on the face of the earth ; and we hold this, that when any class or race have for centuries and generations been singularly oppressed and trodden down—as the slaves in America have been, and slaves everywhere have been—and, in consequence of such treatment, have sunk into a state of debasement, it is the peculiar duty of Christians and of Christian Churches, in the exercise of that generous spirit which the gospel of Christ inspires, to seek by all means in their power to raise them to the same social, moral, and religious platform with themselves, and thus, in the words of Scripture, to “take the poor out of the dust, and the needy from the dunghill, and to set them with princes, even the

princes of the earth." We cordially rejoice in the efforts you have put forth in this direction ; and I think I may venture to assure you, that you will meet with cordial sympathy from the people of Scotland and the people of the Free Church.

And now, my dear brethren, in my inmost heart and soul I stretch out to you the right hand of fellowship in the name of this General Assembly, in the name of the Free Church of Scotland ; and although I am but the Moderator of the Free Church, I think I may venture to say in the name of the whole of Scotland. I accompany this act of mine with the earnest prayer that this blessed interchange of deputations—which I trust will be observed from year to year—may bring us into closer alliance and relationship, and may establish between us a communion of heart and of Christian effort for the benefit of the world at large, of which that bond of intercourse and fellowship that reposes silently under the Atlantic wave, linking the shores of America and Great Britain, will be but a faint emblem.

Before I conclude, I would crave of the Assembly a few minutes, that I may mention a very pleasing circumstance which occurred to myself a few years ago, and which is in perfect harmony with the proceedings of this evening. From it the General Assembly will see that I have somewhat anticipated that agreeable intercourse which has now been established between us. I have to mention that one forenoon, on entering my pulpit, and looking round my congregation, I saw in the body of the church a distinguished-looking stranger, and I may add, with reference to what followed, that he was in aspect more of the "whiskered pandour or the fierce hussar," than of the peaceful soldier of Christ. You may judge of my surprise when, immediately on going to the vestry, I was followed by this gentleman, who presented me with his card. I will not mention his name, but I may state he belonged to Albany ; and this card I keep *in retentis*—in case some future General Assembly may do me the distinguished honour of appointing me upon a deputation—to call upon my friend at Albany. He told me he belonged to the Dutch Presbyterian Church ; that his church was one of the oldest in America ; that it had required repairs ; and that his people, during the time the repairs were going on, wishing him to enjoy the opportunity of recreation, had put a very handsome sum into his pocket, and sent him to make the tour of Europe. He said he was a very great admirer of Dr Chalmers ; and you see this is a prevailing feeling in America, from the terms in which Dr Chalmers' name has been referred to again and again by our dear brethren to-night. Being a great admirer of Dr Chalmers, he had, on reaching the Clyde only the evening before, made a great effort to get to Glasgow, in order that he might worship in the church of Dr Chalmers, and might hear the gospel preached from Dr Chalmers' pulpit. I told him my pulpit was not literally and actually the pulpit of Dr Chalmers, although he had officiated on the occasion when the church was opened, but that it was historically, hereditarily, and constitutionally the pulpit of Dr Chalmers, and that it was the pulpit that would have been occupied by him had he continued to be the minister of St John's, Glasgow. I said to him that if he had so much happiness in being my hearer, I was sure his satisfaction would be doubly increased if he would just occupy the pulpit himself in the afternoon. Well, on that he excused himself, on the score that, from the time he had come

over, he had left nature to take its course uncontrolled, and that he did not think the bushy development his face presented would comport with the sobriety of a Scotch pulpit. I told him he was quite under a mistake—that it would give a great zest to the occasion. Well, he complied; he left me to go to his hotel, and on returning he brought with him several letters to some of the most eminent ministers in the west of Scotland, and put them into my hand, evidently to satisfy me that in taking him on trust I had made no mistake. He entered the pulpit, and preached an admirable discourse upon the doctrine of justification by faith—just such a sermon as we could expect from one of the most accomplished of our own ministers. But this brings me to the point. He evidently wanted to satisfy the people who he was, and whence he came; for in the intercessory part of his first prayer he prayed with an emphasis which went to the heart of every one of us—“May the good Lord bless Queen Victoria and the President of the United States.” (Great Applause.) I say there is a practical lesson in this. I endorse the sentiment with my whole heart; I do it in your name; and I re-echo, “May the Lord bless our beloved Queen Victoria and the President of the United States!” May the Lord bless America and Great Britain in all their relationships to one another. God forbid that discord and strife should ever arise between two nations so closely allied. God grant that they may be united everlastingly in the bonds of truth and love, and in great and glorious efforts for the spread of gospel light and liberty all over the world!

At the close of his address, the Moderator requested the delegates to come forward to the platform, that he might give them all the right hand of fellowship.

TUESDAY, MAY 28.

CASE OF THE REV. WALTER C. SMITH.

The Moderator, as a member of the Presbytery of Glasgow, having vacated the chair, it was taken by Mr Wilson, ex-moderator.

Sir H. W. MONCREIFF said, the Assembly would now take up the case of the Rev. Walter C. Smith, and would first call upon the Synod of Glasgow and Ayr to state the reference. There was no dissent or appeal against the reference.

Dr BEGG—It is right the Assembly should know that, though there is no complaint against the reference, the papers bear that there was a dissent; it was a very close vote.

Sir H. W. MONCREIFF—There was a dissent and no complaint; but we do not know that formally here at present.

Dr GIBSON asked whether the members of Presbytery had anything to say at present?

Sir H. W. MONCREIFF said they had not in stating the reference.

Mr GORDON then read the reference by the Synod as follows:—“It was moved and seconded, ‘That, finding it impossible to take up this case without having the whole papers printed and in the hands of members, and considering the delay which this will necessarily occasion, the Synod resolve to refer the case to the General Assembly.’ It was moved

and seconded, 'That the Synod, after discharging its ordinary business, do adjourn for a fortnight, in order that the papers in the case be printed, and put in the hands of members, with a view to the case being taken up when the Synod re-assembles.' After reasoning, the Synod proceeded to vote. It was agreed that the state of the vote should be, 'refer' or 'not refer;' and the roll having been called, and votes marked, it carried 'refer' by 35 to 28 votes. Whereupon the Synod resolved in terms of the first motion. From this judgment Mr Alex. B. Bruce dissented, for himself and all who might adhere to him. Dr James Begg, Mr Badenoch, Mr R. Williamson, and Mr G. MacAulay, adhered to Mr Bruce's dissent. The Synod appoint Mr James M'Gregor of Paisley, and Mr Walker of Carnwath, to state the reference at the bar of the General Assembly."

Mr WALKER—Moderator, I was appointed, along Mr M'Gregor of Paisley, to state the reference in this case to you to-day. My friend Mr M'Gregor took in hand the opening of the question, at least, but now he has left me to bear the whole burden alone.* However, as Dr Candlish has said, one great thing is, that the parties at the bar in this case should be very brief. I would just say two or three words on the subject; first of all, upon the competency of such a reference being made; and secondly, state in a word what were the views which led the Synod to think it was right that, the reference being competent, it should be made. In regard to the competency of making such a reference as this, it was very strongly argued at the Synod that in any case of protest and appeal which came from an inferior court to a superior court, there must always be a decision given, and that in such a case as that it was altogether incompetent to refer the case at all. Well, upon general principles, it is very difficult to see the reason of that. The idea of a reference is evidently this, that there are certain cases which, because of their peculiar difficulty or delicacy, or from some circumstances connected with them, it is not advisable that an inferior court should decide upon, but that they should transfer the decision to a court above them, and I cannot see why you may not have such a case as that in connexion with a protest and appeal as well as in any other way; in fact, it seems to me that just in such cases you may very often find questions of the most peculiar difficulty and delicacy, and, upon general principles, I am not able to understand why there should be any such difference as some of our friends have attempted to make out. However, I know the difficulty of convincing people by general principles in regard to a question of this kind, and I have looked for some proof on the point from the previous actings of the Assembly to guide us, and I find that there is. I am not very great in Acts of Assembly, but I have been turning them over, and I find a case in point which bears directly upon the present one. I hold in my hand the Acts of Assembly for 1831. That was the year in which the famous Row case came before the Assembly. It came up before the Synod of Glasgow and Ayr. There were two appeals. First, there was an appeal in regard to the question of the relevancy of libel; and secondly, an appeal in regard to a great number of findings of the Dumbarton Presbytery. The Dumbarton Presbytery found the libel relevant, and found a large

* It will be seen further on that Mr M'Gregor gave a satisfactory explanation of his absence.

number of the counts proven. The appeal was then taken to the Synod of Glasgow and Ayr; which Court, after dealing with the question of relevancy, and deciding that the libel was relevant, referred, *simpliciter*, the whole question of the findings upon the various counts to the General Assembly. That one case proves unmistakably that it was considered competent to refer a case like the present one. This proves the general competency of such a reference; and, more than that, I think the case of Row was not so delicate or difficult as the case now before us, showing, *a fortiori*, that if the appeal in the case was sustained as valid in the case of Row, our reference in a much more difficult case should be sustained by the General Assembly to-day. In regard to the general reasons which weighed with the Synod, they were such as these. We came to the Synod, and found it was utterly impossible to deal with the case at the regular meeting of the Synod. There was a vast number of papers never printed, and it was out of the question that they should be read to us, and that we should go on at once into a full consideration of the case. It was quite clear that if the Synod were to enter into the merits of the case, the papers would have to be printed. That would take at least a week, which period would have to be extended to at least a fortnight for an examination of the papers and some general consultation. There would thus require to be another meeting of Synod within a very brief space of the meeting of Assembly. It was thought not desirable that, in the circumstances, we should enter into the case at all. Very likely, at least quite possibly, we should not get a good meeting of Synod. It was very doubtful whether a large number of the members, who were shortly to be at the Assembly for a fortnight, would be able, immediately before it, to give a week to this matter; and, if we had a small meeting, the result might have been disastrous to the case, unfair to Mr Smith himself, or unfair to the interests of the Church. We had no security that we would get a good meeting of Synod to deal with such a case as this. We thought this a very strong reason for putting the matter before the Assembly. Moreover, the Synod had the conviction that the matter had been discussed and re-discussed in the committee of the Presbytery and in the Presbytery of Glasgow. Committees sat on it, and brought before the Presbytery elaborate reports. What was needed was not so much a discussion in the Synod as a decision. What was wanted really to quiet the agitation in the public mind upon it was a decision of the Supreme Court. We did not think that, in reference to the discussion of the merits, we could contribute very much; and we were not perhaps without some regard also to this, that if the matter were taken up in the Synod, one of the largest and greatest Synods in the Church would be disfranchised in the Assembly. Perhaps we did not lay much stress upon that, but I am told that this was a very common ground upon which references were sustained in the Assemblies of other days. At any rate, I think we are more likely to contribute to the right decision of this case by sitting here upon it in the Assembly than we would have been by discussing it in Glasgow. Upon these and other grounds, which I don't think it necessary to trouble the Assembly with, the Synod thought that the reference was good. I beg just to say this: the Assembly must dismiss from its thoughts the idea that the Synod was shirking discussion. We have not, Sir, as a Synod, been wont to shrink from the discussion of difficult subjects. It was from a sense of

the gravity of the case—looked at in all its aspects—that many of us who would have liked a discussion there, thought it best to hand it over at once to the General Assembly. I now close, hoping that the Assembly will sustain the reference; and may I also in closing hope that the Great Pastor will be with us to-day, guiding us in our deliberations upon what I feel to be a most solemn and momentous occasion. (Applause.)

Mr THORBURN, Leith, asked whether any statements had been made in the case of the Synod, or any papers read to the Synod?

Mr WALKER replied in the affirmative, adding that the papers bringing up the appeal were brought before the Synod. The reasons of dissent and the answers to them were submitted, and the report of the Presbytery, and relative papers, calling for a retraction of certain statements made by Mr Smith, had been circulated throughout the Synod the week before.

Dr GIBSON—I have just to state, as a matter of fact, that neither the large Report of the Presbytery nor—

Sir HENRY MONCREIFF—I do not see how a member of the Presbytery of Glasgow has any right to say anything. (Hear, hear.)

Dr BEGG said he was present, though not a member of Synod, and that his recollection differed entirely from that of Mr Walker. No statement of the case was heard, and the papers were never read. The moment that the matter was introduced, the proposal as to a reference was taken up.

Mr WALKER—The reasons of appeal and the answers to them were read.

Sir HENRY MONCREIFF—Parties are removed. (Laughter and applause.)

Sir H. W. MONCREIFF said that there could have been no doubt as to the competency of the Synod referring their case, if they had first heard the parties at the bar. (Some one here said that the parties were heard as to the reference.) They were heard, I know, (said Sir H. W. M.,) as to the reference, but not on the merits. If they had been heard on the merits the reference would be clearly competent. The competency was more doubtful when they were not so heard. For, in ordinary circumstances, the case ought to have been heard at the bar of the Synod in order that the whole case might be before the Court previous to the reference. But the reference is made on the ground of the difficulty of the case being done justice to either by hearing parties at the bar, or as to the judgment. (Hear.) The difficulty, as stated in the reasons given by the Synod, was, that the case was of such a character, manifestly, that all the papers must be printed in order to enable the Synod to judge of it, and that could not be done conveniently or for the interests of the case previously to the Assembly. That is the ground of the reference. And, he thought, when a Synod finds itself in a difficulty in a case at any stage, it is entitled to refer the case to the Superior Court. He would go farther, and say that even if he disapproved, on the whole, of the Synod having made the reference, this being the Supreme Court, they were entitled to sustain the reference in the circumstances. If they think it would be more for the interests of the Church to do so, it was in the power of this Assembly, on that ground alone, to sustain the reference; and he thought it was for the interests of the Church in the case that they should go into the merits, in order to prevent an injurious delay. (“Hear,” and applause.) They

were entitled to sustain the reference in the shape in which it had come before them, and he moved that the reference be sustained. (Hear, hear.)

Mr THORBURN, Leith, did not rise for the purpose of moving a counter-motion, but to express his regret that the case was not taken up by the Synod and a judgment pronounced upon it.

Mr NIXON considered that it was very wrong to the Assembly that there should be any reference like this without the brethren of the Synod having exhausted the whole case. He knew a case in the Synod of Perth, in which the papers were very voluminous and were not printed. Though the time before the meeting of the Assembly was as short in that case as in the present case, the Synod of Perth very dutifully adjourned for a fortnight, got the papers printed, and returned like men to their posts and considered the case. He held it was the bounden duty of the Synod of Glasgow and Ayr to have acted in like manner. The mere difficulty of the case was not a reason for not entering into its consideration. Who knew, if that Synod had done their duty in the matter, but that a great deal of additional light might have been cast on the case—so much as to facilitate its due settlement? He was not, however, going to make a counter-motion; but he thought it was highly desirable that the Assembly should, by the wording of the minute, indicate to the inferior courts that the Assembly were not to be held as being quite ready to receive any reference of that kind; and that they would maintain their position and insist that the Synods of the Church should perform the duties incumbent upon them.

Sir HENRY MONCREIFF said he had no objection to this deliverance—"The Assembly, without expressing any opinion as to the best course for the Synod to have pursued, but looking to the circumstances in which the case comes before us, sustain the reference."

This was unanimously agreed to, and the reference was sustained.

Parties were then called, when there appeared at the bar:—for the Presbytery of Glasgow—Mr R. C. Smith, Dr Gibson, Mr A. N. Somerville, Dr Forbes, and Dr A. S. Paterson. For the Dissentients and Complainants—Professor Douglas, Mr Freer, Dr Lorimer, and Dr Buchanan.

Sir HENRY MONCREIFF said the Assembly thought it right to ask whether Mr Smith appeared. He was not a party in the case, although the question concerned him, and it was thought that if he appeared he would have the right to do so; but at the same time the Assembly simply asked the question.

Dr GIBSON said he was not sure whether the Presbytery could answer, but so far as he knew the Presbytery had no knowledge. Mr Smith never had appeared as a party either in the Synod or, in point of fact, in the Presbytery, in the form of taking any dissent of any kind.

Sir HENRY MONCREIFF—Yes, we know that; we see it on the face of the papers. (Laughter.)

Dr GIBSON—I should like to know what Sir Henry Moncreiff's question is, then.

Sir HENRY MONCREIFF—The question is simply whether Mr Smith appears—whether he is here or not.

Dr GIBSON—I am sure I cannot tell whether he is here or not.

Sir HENRY MONCREIFF—The answer can only be given by himself.

Dr BUCHANAN—In answer to Sir Henry Moncreiff's question, and in

order that there may be no mistake about Mr Smith's feelings and position, I may state I have a letter in my hand, addressed to another member of the Presbytery, in which Mr Smith says—"I send my address, and if my presence be required on Tuesday telegraph to me, and I shall be there by the first train after getting the telegram. I do not think this will be necessary, but you will have it in your power at least to inform the Court that I am ready to appear whenever I am required. My health is greatly improved, but I am still weakly and nervous, and my eyes have been again troubling me." He simply thinks his presence is unnecessary, but he means no disrespect to the Assembly.

Dr CANDLISH—I produce a volume, entitled on title-page "Sermon on the Mount; Lectures delivered by the Rev. W. C. Smith, author of 'The Bishop's Walk,'" and so on. Had Mr Smith been here, I intended to ask, through the Moderator, whether he was the author of this book. But as he is not present, I may put this question to the Presbytery—whether they know anything of this book.

Dr GIBSON—I have no objection to any party that pleases availing themselves of what is in that book, but it has never been before the Presbytery in any form, and if any party chooses to refer to it, I only crave the liberty that we shall be allowed to refer to it in like manner.

Dr CANDLISH—It is not a question of liberty at all; it is simply the question—Can the Presbytery throw any light upon this book being Mr Smith's?

Dr FORBES—We saw a book in the hands of the Moderator, which appeared to be bound very much like that book, and in the same style; but really, *quoad ultra*, we know nothing about it. (Laughter.)

Professor DOUGLAS said that when the case was before the Synod, Mr Smith sent a copy of that book to the Synod, stating it was written by him, and desiring that it should be laid on the table of the House, in order that they might make any use of it they pleased. The Synod, however, declined to do so, reckoning themselves a mere court of review, and not wishing to meddle with any additional matter.

Dr CANDLISH—I have got the answer I wanted—namely, that this book has been acknowledged by Mr Smith as his.

Dr GIBSON asked how many parties were to be heard on either side.

Sir HENRY MONCREIFF read the standing orders on this point, to the effect that in no case should there be more than two speeches for each party, including the reply, to which the appellant and complainer shall be entitled.

Dr BUCHANAN said the appellants had been under an impression different from what had been read by Sir Henry Moncreiff; and accordingly it had been arranged between Professor Douglas and Mr Freer that the one should take one branch of the opening, and the other another branch. Of course, if the House should decide that the standing orders must be rigidly adhered to, Professor Douglas must strive to make the two speeches himself. (Laughter.)

Dr GIBSON did not see it would make any material difference to the Presbytery, but at the same time, if the standing orders were to be departed from in the one case, they must be suspended in the other.

On the motion of Dr CANDLISH, it was resolved that the standing orders should not be suspended.

Mr BROWN DOUGLAS called the attention of the house to section 5 of the standing orders.

Sir HENRY MONCREIFF read the section referred to, to the effect that justice demands that no one should vote who had not been listening to the pleadings.

Mr BROWN DOUGLAS added that, with a view of doing justice to the case, it was to be hoped the parties at the bar would make the pleadings as short and concise as possible, because it would be impossible to comply with the spirit of the standing orders if the pleadings were lengthened out for many hours in the forenoon.

Professor DOUGLAS then addressed the Court in behalf of the dissentients and complainers. He said—I have to bring before this venerable Court a case which has been very painful and anxious to us all. I should have been heartily glad that the task of laying the matter before you had fallen into abler and more experienced hands; yet, with the strong convictions which I entertain, I could not shrink from the duty when it was laid upon me. I should have been thankful to the great Head of the Church, as I believe every member of our Presbytery would have been, had this case, with the offence which it necessarily involved, not arisen to disturb and vex us. But since it pleased Him to permit it to arise, it is my belief that He has overruled the evil for an evolution of good from it; and the nature of our dissent and complaint is simply this, that we think that the whole good has been evolved out of it, and that a further prosecution of it must rather tend to have evil consequences. I do not expect, of course, that my friends on the other side of the bar will admit this. But I am confident that they, and that this Court, will be of opinion that our Presbytery has not failed to give very full consideration to the case, to give consideration almost unexampled in its fulness, when you observe the number and the length of the Presbytery meetings, and when to these are added all the meetings of committee, my belief is that we were becoming exhausted with our labours; I shall yet have to suggest that this exhaustion may account for some peculiarities in the proceedings of the Presbytery on October 3d; and I cannot but think it is well that a higher Court should here step in, and gather up the results of our proceedings from May 2d till November 19th, without even the risk of any imputation of excitement, or of the influence of preconceived opinions. What confirms me in the belief that we in the Presbytery became exhausted is this, that I really do not think I understand the answers to our reasons of dissent and complaint; and I think there is something said in them of a similar difficulty in apprehending our reasons. Having glanced at the history of the case, Professor Douglas said—The present position of the case may be understood better by some if I classify the papers before us, and say that, besides the Presbytery minutes and our reasons of dissent, there are here three classes of printed documents. One class consists of Mr Smith's two sermons, and his explanatory statements regarding them; also his answers to the two statements of the Presbytery, and his final statement. Another class consists of the two reports of the original Committee of Presbytery; the first report being upon his sermons and his first explanatory statement, and the second report being on these with the addition of his second statement. In a third class of documents I place what may be named the third report of the Presbytery, namely, the report of the committee appointed after his answers were pronounced to be unsatisfactory. Now it is only against this last document that we complain; our dissent is merely against its adoption

and approval by the Presbytery ; for we concurred in the two previous reports, and several of us had our full share of the labour and responsibility of drawing them up ; and of course we also concurred with all heartiness in the action of the Presbytery when it adopted and approved of them. But the nature, the suitableness, and the value of that first report (against which alone we direct our dissent and complaint) can be understood and estimated only in the light of our previous united action, to which therefore I ask your careful attention. That attention indeed is now comparatively easily given, the papers being all printed, and having been in the hands of those members who chose to have them before the meeting of Assembly. It is not necessary, therefore, for me to enlarge upon them, more especially as I had left some of the doctrinal matters to the care of my friend Mr Freer, whose great theological knowledge is only equalled by his modesty, and who, I regret to say, is prevented by the rules of the House from placing before the Assembly a paper he had prepared, which would have been especially valuable. But there are one or two somewhat preliminary remarks which I am anxious to make. The first of these remarks is, that there is a vast deal in these sermons and subsequent statements with which we were greatly dissatisfied, and which might have, perhaps, suitably come under the notice of the Presbytery, certainly, at least, under the notice of individual ministers for private and friendly dealing with Mr Smith, although they might not have come under the category of heretical teaching. Accordingly, many of these were noticed in the speeches of members of Presbytery—such as his amazing blunder in exegesis, as if his text could mean that the law was to be annulled which it spoke of not destroying but fulfilling ; the comparison of the Old and New Testaments to the draft of a will and the will itself, instead of to a will and a codicil, which true comparison would have saved the preacher from a mass of crudities and difficulties ; the comparison of the old Law of Moses to the dimly burning lamp in morning, when the shutters are opened and daylight streams in ; and a number of instances adduced by Mr Smith in his answers to the two questions. In addition to the matter of these statements, there was much in the manner of them that grated on my feelings, and as I believe on those of my brethren, especially on account of what had at least an appearance of flippancy, of which I am convinced that his own calmer and better judgment disapproves. A second remark is, that the most objectionable statements, and those on which from the first we agreed to concentrate attention (because after the settlement of these we hoped to have the rest easily adjusted), were connected with two points of doctrine—the one being the perfection and immutability of the moral law, which God delivered to Israel in the Decalogue, and the other being the independent and permanent authority of the Old Testament as an integral and very large part of that only rule to direct us how to glorify and enjoy God. And while I did cherish the hope in my own mind that Mr Smith's sentiments were sounder than his language often seemed to imply, and while his subsequent explanations confirmed me in this opinion, and convinced me that he had confused himself by loose rhetorical expressions, which had a look of novelty and a majestic sound, and yet which shrunk away to little or nothing when we came to deal more closely with them ; still this did not alter my opinion that the language was very reprehensible. For I held these unguarded and exaggerated statements to be of a most exciting or inflammable nature.

They bore upon questions that emphatically demand from us reverent and judicious handling, owing to currents of opinion and other influences at the present day, which I think unfavourable to a correct solution of such questions. And even if there were counter-balancing influences in Mr Smith's own mind (as I had every reason to think there were), which might keep the dangerous elements in check in his own individual case, we might well apprehend that these checks would operate feebly, or not at all, in the case of many of his hearers, who might probably be carried away by the attractiveness of novel views which seemed to promise a certain freedom and advancement in religion and morality. And this conviction on our part no doubt led us to scan his words more narrowly than otherwise we might have done; and this is our defence, if we seem ever to have been a little hard upon him, as, in the commencement of his second statement, he inclines to think that we have been. My third and last preliminary remark is that, in dealing with those errors which we believed to be contained in the language of the sermons, the committee were heartily unanimous; and so were the members of Presbytery. And whatever differences have unfortunately emerged afterwards, let us be thankful to the great Head of the Church that there is not a shadow of difference on any doctrinal point truly belonging to the case, as in these two first reports of the committee—reports in the preparation of which I myself took a place so thoroughly subordinate and unimportant that I can very freely give my opinion. I deem them masterly productions. I think that on these two points—namely, first, the perfection and immutability of the moral law, which is summarily comprehended in the Ten Commandments; and, second, the relation of the Old to the New Testament in the one supreme rule of faith and duty—they contain very clear and correct statements of evangelical truth such as are likely to be valuable to those who handle a difficult subject in a somewhat unsettled state of public opinion. It might have been not unreasonably feared, that the free and full dealing with some intricate matters of theology thus rashly thrust upon our consideration, would have shown that some members of so large a Presbytery as ours had been taken at unawares, or had been involved in some uncertainty. Is it not most gratifying that there was nothing of the kind discovered—all the more gratifying, that it soon came out that there was independence enough in many minds to express their feelings and opinions frankly upon other matters imported into this case, however painful that expression of difference might be. I regard the procedure of the Presbytery at the meeting on September 12, after nearly four months' interval, as our most important act, the true turning-point of the whole case; for, on that day, our second report was adopted, and the following recommendation in the close of it became the unanimous judgment of the Presbytery:—"That the two discourses of Mr Smith be disapproved and censured, as containing statements regarding the Moral Law and the Old Testament Scriptures which are at variance with the language of the Confession and the teachings of Scripture." Observe what we did; we pronounced judgment on the sermons, disapproving and censuring them. We might have proceeded by libel, found him guilty, and pronounced judgment; and our sentence would have been final, if no appeal was taken. We actually did what amounted to the same thing, though we took a shorter course, as was natural and sensible in the circumstances, in a matter where all the facts are plain and notorious.

Mr Smith had as little wish as we had that needless formalities and delays should intervene. Then, we not merely declared the sermons censurable, but we actually censured them; we pronounced censure on them, and he bore this censure without appeal. So the sentence was at once pronounced and executed, the matter became a *res judicata*; and no one on earth has any right to bring Mr Smith to trial any more for that offence, unless a circumstance should intervene to which I shall advert almost immediately. But was not this too light a sentence? Possibly it was; and, if so, censure the judges, but not the person whom they judged. Yet, there were many things about Mr Smith's position which seemed to me to make this sentence sufficiently severe. And there was the important fact, ever taken into account in pronouncing sentence, either in a civil or an ecclesiastical court, that Mr Smith had brought the whole matter before us of his own free accord; had made his first statement spontaneously, had laid the sermons at once on our table, inviting attention to them, had furnished information on every point with the utmost readiness, had withheld nothing, and shown no desire to do so, as is proved abundantly by all that has come from his pen in these printed papers, and as the committee have had additional means of knowing from papers *in retentis*. And there was yet another fact to account for no severer sentence being pronounced; that to which I alluded just now, as keeping the matter open in case a circumstance should supervene—I mean the further recommendation of the committee, which the Presbytery adopted, to put two questions to Mr Smith, upon the two topics handled in the sermons which had just been censured. We presented two questions to him, which might carry his thoughts into a somewhat different track, and lead him to answer us in such a way as to let us know his state of mind on that September 12th. I know that there has been fault found with us for putting Mr Smith through an inquisitorial process, by asking him to answer these questions, and so placing him under a new test which we had ourselves devised. Now, any one who reads that conclusion of our second report will see that this blame has been attached to us through misapprehension. We were inventing no new Confession of Faith. We were not subjecting Mr Smith to the operation of a new and more stringent test. We were desirous of knowing his mind on two topics, if possible, in language away from that which he had been using and then attempting to explain to us; and we suggested this new language in our questions. But this was intended as a help and not as a snare for him. And we never meant to urge him to give any answer at all, unless he considered it desirable to do so: the only pressure we exerted upon him was to keep him from answering too hastily at the moment when the questions were propounded. He did delay replying for a fortnight; but unfortunately there seems to have been something rankling in his mind of the sort of feeling which I have been describing, and which I have attributed to misapprehension. Accordingly, the tone of his answers seems to me extremely unfortunate, and I have no doubt it has given an unduly unfavourable impression of him to many; as I also do not doubt that this impression has been deepened by many illustrations in these answers which seem to me rash, illogical, and of dangerous tendency. This may have been the cause of that decision of the Presbytery on October 3d, which pronounced them unsatisfactory. From that meeting I myself was most unwillingly detained by a sharp illness; and I am

perfectly willing to say now, what I avoided saying before, that had I been present I should have supported Dr Fairbairn's motion, and that I don't see any reason to think that I would not have pressed it to a decision ; for which reason partly I was the first to dissent six weeks later. But there is a certain obscurity about that protracted meeting, from early in the day till midnight, through which I have never been able to see daylight. My own impression has sometimes been, that all the members became exhausted, and that the whole Presbytery fell into a certain confusion and irregularity.

Dr FORBES—These motions were both made in the forenoon.

Professor DOUGLAS—A certain confusion and irregularity, against which I sometimes thought of guarding myself by going to the Synod with a petition to have it declared that Dr Fairbairn's motion never had been settled. For that motion was duly moved and seconded, and was met by Dr Forbes' amendment. After protracted discussion during the day and night, Dr Buchanan made a third motion, which Dr Fairbairn agreed to support instead of his own. Dr Buchanan, however, subsequently withdrew his, and Dr Forbes' was supposed to be left alone in the field. But Dr Fairbairn's had been duly seconded, and had been the substantive motion, the subject of the discussion throughout the long day ; and I question the equity of leaving it out of account when Dr Buchanan's had come to be withdrawn, as I certainly question the formal legality of holding the motion to be set aside without the consent of the seconder, if possible, being asked and obtained. Dr Forbes' motion was in this way, and in these peculiar circumstances, recorded as carried unanimously, that Mr Smith's answers were unsatisfactory, so that it was accepted at night by men who in the morning moved they were "in substantial harmony with the Standards." (Laughter.) Plainly these men could not mean that the answers were doctrinally unsatisfactory, whatever Dr Forbes or others may have meant. And since Dr Fairbairn's substantive motion involves the termination of the case there and then, the very utmost that can be held to be necessarily involved in Dr Forbes' amendment to it is this, that the answers were unsatisfactory in this sense, and to this extent, that the case could not be finished at that meeting of Presbytery. Professor Douglas was proceeding to make some remarks on the report of the committee of which Dr Forbes was convener, and the unreasonableness of their insisting that Mr Smith should make certain retractations, and in reference to the complaint of conflict between the sermons and the Confession of Faith on several doctrines of vital moment, when

Mr M'GREGOR, Paisley, said he understood Mr Freer had a paper to read on this subject, which he would like to hear.

Professor DOUGLAS said Mr Freer had prepared a very valuable paper on this part of the question, but according to the rules of the House he could not now be allowed to read it. But might not he (Professor Douglas) read it as part of his speech ?

Dr GIBSON said he had consulted Dr Forbes, and neither of them had any objections. (Applause.)

Mr FREER asked if in these circumstances he might not be allowed to read it himself, as it would facilitate the business.

Dr GIBSON said he had no objection to this either. (Applause.)

Professor DOUGLAS asked if he might finish his own speech before Mr Freer read his paper.

Dr GIBSON thought it would be better that the paper should be introduced as part of the speech of Professor Douglas, and so comply with the rules of the House.

Dr BEGG had no objection to the paper being read, but they must not have the Standing Orders nominally enforced but really violated. In this case they should have first Professor Douglas' speech, then Mr Freer's paper, and lastly Dr Buchanan's reply.

Professor DOUGLAS said he was not at all anxious about the matter ; but he thought Mr Freer's reading his own paper would enable them to finish much more speedily.

Mr BRUCE, Cardross, thought that if the parties at the bar were agreeable, the House should make no question about this.

Dr BEGG—I should like to know whether, on that theory, Professor Douglas might not invite A, B, C, and D to go to the bar and read separate statements, calling them all the time Professor Douglas' statements ?

Dr BUCHANAN wished it to be understood that the parties at the bar were not pressing this upon the House. If the Standing Orders were to be enforced, they were ready to comply with them.

Dr CANDLISH—Why could not Professor Douglas read it as part of his speech ? If he cannot read it, it must be very badly written indeed. (Laughter.)

Professor DOUGLAS accordingly read the principal portions of Mr Freer's paper as follows :—I held from the first, and hold still, that the terms used by Mr Smith are not such as to preclude the possibility of a different interpretation being put upon them. My reason for holding this opinion is this—there is evidence in the sermons themselves that, in speaking of the Scriptures and moral law, Mr Smith did not, throughout his discussion of these subjects, use the terms Scripture and moral law in one uniform sense, so that his statements in one part of the sermons appear to be in conflict with statements found in some other part. Language that is only strictly applicable to the Old Testament dispensation as a dispensation, is applied to the Old Testament Scriptures as Scriptures ; and while we are informed of the immutability of moral law, we are also told of the abrogation of a law that “ is certainly and essentially moral,” (p. 15, D.) Facts such as these prove that Mr Smith has been very unguarded in his language, but they at the same time make it perfectly credible, at least, that he did not intend to teach what the Presbytery asserted that his sermons actually taught. And although I do not wish to refer to any document that is not at present before this Court in an official form, I may be allowed to say in passing that the credibility of what I have just alleged is very much strengthened by the general tone of the teaching pervading the volume of sermons which Mr Smith has published, and of which the sermons under review form a part. (An objection was here made by some members to this reference to the volume. Professor Douglas stated in explanation that he believed Mr Freer had made no other reference to it, and it might be best to hold it not to have been now made.) Still further, as bearing upon this question of credibility, it is right to bear in mind that every writer or speaker has his own peculiar phraseology and style of thought ; and that while the language he employs may not be misinterpreted by those who are acquainted with it, it may be liable to grave objections on the part of those who are not similarly initiated. The fragmentary notes of

a discourse would suggest very little to the mind of any one but the author. But to him they are instinct with meaning; and even where one's ideas are fully expressed, the terms in which these ideas are represented may have a narrower or wider application, according as the sign does or does not become an adequate expression of the thing signified. I do not offer this as an excuse for any one indulging in a loose and exaggerated style of speech, even though it were found that such a practice tended to arrest attention. All that I would found upon such a fact is, that extremeness of language does not necessarily indicate like extremeness of doctrine. So far, therefore, from its being incredible that the terms in which Mr Smith has spoken of the Old Testament Scriptures and of moral law meant nothing more than the abolition of so much as constituted the regulative code of a dispensation that has passed away, and the abolition of so much of the form of moral law as had reference to that dispensation, the incredibility rather lies on the side of believing that Mr Smith could ever have meant anything more than this. It is well nigh impossible to conceive of any man who knows what moral law is venturing to speak of its being abolished. But it is perfectly conceivable that one might speak of the abolition of the form in which that moral law was expressed as an abolition of moral law; and to show that this is not only conceivable, but perfectly credible, I shall take the liberty of reading one or two extracts from the works of Calvin. In Calvin's Commentary on 2d Corinthians, chap. iii., vers. 4-11, we read as follows:—"The apostle says, the law was but for a time, and required to be abolished, but that the gospel, on the other hand, remains for ever. There are various reasons why the ministry of Moses is pronounced temporary, for it was necessary that the shadows should vanish at the coming of Christ, and that statement, 'the law and the prophets were until John,' (Matt. xi. 13,) applies to more than mere shadows; for it intimates that Christ has put an end to the ministry of Moses, which was peculiar to Him, and is distinguished from the gospel. Finally, the Lord declares by Jeremiah that the weakness of the Old Testament arose from this, that it was not engraven on men's hearts, (Jer. xxxi. 33.) For my part, I understand that abolition of the law, of which mention is here made, as referring to the whole of the Old Testament, in so far as it is opposed to the gospel, so that it corresponds with the statement, 'the law and the prophets were until John.' For Paul is not reasoning here as to mere ceremonies, but shows how much more powerfully the Spirit of God exercises His power in the gospel than of old under the law." Thus far Calvin. Here it is to be observed, 1st, That in speaking of the abolition of the whole of the Old Testament, in so far as it is opposed to the gospel, Calvin does the very same thing that is done by Mr Smith, when he speaks of the whole of the Old Testament Scriptures being annulled by being fulfilled in the New. The language of Calvin is, indeed, far more guarded, and less fitted to mislead, than that employed by Mr Smith; but the statements are in both cases essentially the same. By both, language which in strictness is only applicable to the Old Testament dispensation, as a dispensation, is applied to the Old Testament Scriptures as Scriptures. But as Calvin meant nothing more, in using such terms, than that all in the Old Testament that related to an abrogated dispensation was annulled, it cannot be deemed an incredible thing that Mr Smith from the first meant nothing more than this. 2d, Calvin here recognises the possibility of

moral law being changed as to the form of its expression, while the law itself remains unchanged and unchangeable. On this point he says still more expressly in the "Institutes," book ii., chap. 11 :—"The constancy of God is conspicuous in this, that He delivered the same doctrine to all ages, and persists in requiring that worship of His name which He commanded at the beginning. His changing the external form does not show that He is liable to change. In so far He has only accommodated himself to the unstable and diversified capacities of man." And again, in his commentary on the Gospel of John, chap. iv. ver. 36, we find Calvin using these words :—"In order that this passage may be properly understood, we must comprehend the contrast between sowing and reaping. The sowing was the doctrine of the law and the prophets ; for at that time the seed sown into the soil remained as it were in the blade ; but the doctrine of the gospel which brings men to proper maturity is, on that account, justly compared to the harvest. For the law was very far from that perfection which has at length been exhibited to us in Christ." On the subject of the moral law, then, we find Calvin laying down principles which are again and again reiterated by Mr Smith in his sermons ; and although Mr Smith may, in the application of these principles, have ventured upon ground where Calvin would not have ventured, still this does not affect the main question as to the possibility of harmonising such principles with the teaching of Scripture and the Confession of Faith. A wrong inference may be drawn from a right principle, but in judging of the soundness of a man's views, the judgment is based on the nature of the principles held, and not on any fanciful illustration or application of them. If, then, the language of Calvin covers the two main positions taken up by Mr Smith in his sermons,—viz., 1st, That the Old Testament Scriptures were annulled by being fulfilled in the New, that is, that all in the Old Testament opposed to the gospel has been abrogated. 2d, That while moral law is, as such, necessarily immutable, the form in which that moral law is expressed may vary according to the requirements of those who are the subjects of that law ; this fact must afford a *prima facie* ground for believing the consistency of the doctrine set forth in the explanatory statements with the teaching contained in the sermons. Had the statements in the sermons been absolutely contradictory of the statements in the explanations given to the Presbytery, there could, in that case, have been no possibility of harmonising the one with the other ; for, of two mutually contradictory statements both cannot be true. But it has never been alleged that the sermons and explanatory statements were mutually exclusive of each other. It may be difficult to bring them into perfect harmony, but this difficulty is no insuperable barrier to their being harmonised ; and after hearing the way in which Calvin speaks of the questions at issue, it must, at least, be deemed a credible thing that Mr Smith's explanatory statements are no afterthought, but only a clearer and more accurate statement of the views which he held at the time the sermons were written. It will not be difficult for the respondents in this case to quote numerous passages from Calvin, declaring, in the strongest terms, the organic unity of the whole revelation contained in the written Word, and the immutability of moral law and the perfection of the Decalogue as a summary of that law. But any measure of such testimony, instead of weakening, would only strengthen the force of the testimony presented in the extracts that I have read. It is just because that testimony

comes from a man whose orthodoxy on the questions at issue is beyond all doubt—from a man who, above all others, understood and revered the whole Word of God, and held not only the immutability of moral law, but the perfection of the Decalogue as a summary of that law, that the testimony that has been adduced has the greatest weight. Coming from such a man, the greatest and wisest of all theologians, it has a value which this Assembly will best know how to appreciate. Assuming, then, that the explanatory statements are to be received as a clearer exhibition of the doctrine taught in the sermons, so that the sermons are to be read in the light of the commentary thus supplied, it remains to be seen how far the doctrine taught in both is in harmony with Scripture and the Confession of Faith. And as the whole doctrine involved in this case is comprehended under the two heads of the committee's first report, it will be unnecessary to refer to anything either in the sermons or explanatory statements that does not directly bear either upon the subject of the relation of the Old Testament Scriptures to the New, or to the subject of the moral law and the Decalogue. And, I. As to the relation of the Old Testament Scriptures to the New. On this point there are indeed many extreme and startling statements made in the sermons. The author in his anxiety to clear the ground of false principles, has, in more than one instance, spoken unadvisedly, and has, throughout the greater part of the discussion of this branch of the subject, indulged in a free and easy way of handling the Old Testament Scriptures. The style in which the discussion is conducted has given great offence to many, and has excited a strong prejudice against the sermons as a whole. But, putting out of view all that may justly be objected to on this ground, there is no difficulty in ascertaining the precise import of the teaching of the sermons and of the relative explanatory statements. Mr Smith starts with the position that by the law and the prophets the Jews meant the whole of the Old Testament Scriptures, and that it was concerning these Scriptures that Christ was speaking when He said, "Think not that I am come to destroy the law or the prophets; I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil." Having thus determined that Christ is speaking of the whole of the Old Testament Scriptures, the next thing to be ascertained is the meaning of the term "fulfil." Viewing the fact that Christ's fulfilment of the ancient law led to its formal abrogation, Mr Smith reaches the conclusion that Christ in fulfilling the whole of the Old Testament Scriptures annulled them. All of the Old is fulfilled in the New, and is by this very fact abrogated and annulled. Such a way of stating the case is fitted to alarm and mislead. It may easily be interpreted as a complete setting aside of the Old Testament Scriptures—as a denial of their now forming a component part of the one perfect Revelation of God. Yet this is not what Mr Smith ever intended to teach, as is manifest even from the sermons themselves. For (at page 20, letter B) he thus expresses himself—"I do not indeed say—you would utterly misunderstand if you supposed me to mean—that these Scriptures are not altogether useless. On the contrary, they remain, and ever shall remain, a most helpful commentary and illustration, profitable in a hundred ways for doctrine, and correction, and instruction, and reproof in righteousness." And, following up this statement, Mr Smith goes on to show how the histories, laws, proverbs, psalms and prophetic writings of the Old Testament Scriptures will minister to the awakening, edification, and comfort of the Church

in all ages. Manifestly, therefore, the doctrine that Christ, in fulfilling, has annulled all the ancient Scriptures, was meant to be understood by the author under certain restrictions. For he actually assigns a permanent place and importance to documents which he had described as being for ever abrogated and annulled. How is this to be accounted for, unless on the principle laid down by Mr Smith, in his third explanatory statement (p. 84, D.) He there says—"Let me remind you, therefore, that such words as 'annul' and 'abrogate,' if applied to books at all, can only be applied to books of law, or to those which contain illustrations of such law, claiming authority as examples. The use of our language imposes this limitation. If it be overlooked, we speak, not English, but nonsense. It is the law of those books, or their illustrations of law, which can alone be said to be annulled or abrogated." The sum of the explanation is this—that, while speaking of the old economy or dispensation, he spoke of it under the name of the Scriptures, containing the laws of that economy. The abrogation of the ancient dispensation was the abrogation of the documents containing the laws of that dispensation; and thus, in so far as an economy is abrogated, are the documents containing its special code of laws annulled. In the light of this explanation, one can easily see how Mr Smith was led to speak as he has done regarding the Scriptures of the Old Testament being fulfilled, and thereby annulled by those of the New. So far, then, as the general principle is concerned—that the abrogation of a dispensation involves the abrogation of its regulative code—there is no difference of opinion. But the question immediately arises—How much of the ancient Scriptures come under the description of being the regulative documents of a dispensation that has passed away? How much of their teaching on matters of doctrine, worship, and duty is now binding on us? This question may be answered in two ways. Either, first, it may be said that all of the Old is binding that has not been formally or by implication abolished by the New; or, second, it may be held that nothing in the Old is binding on us but what has been formally or by implication sanctioned by the New. The first of these canons of interpretation is that which has been generally held by theologians. The second, which is held by Mr Smith, though not generally accepted by theologians, is no new canon of interpretation, and has been held by some whose orthodoxy and piety were undoubted. Practically, it may matter little which canon of interpretation be adopted, for in both cases the appeal is equally made to the New Testament as the determining standard. To say with Calvin that the Old Testament is abolished, in so far as it is opposed to the gospel, differs very little from saying, with Mr Smith, that the Old Testament is abolished in so far as it is not reaffirmed in the gospel. For that which is opposed to the gospel is not reaffirmed or sanctioned by it; and that which it does sanction is that to which it is not opposed. Besides, as the Confession of Faith does not give any deliverance on the question raised by Mr Smith's canon of interpretation, his opinion on this point cannot be made a subject of review, unless it could be shown to involve practical consequences that would be in conflict with one or other of the doctrines of the Confession. But this has not been shown. Mr Smith's theory, if it had not been guarded by declarations as to the inspiration of the Old Testament Scriptures—as to the equal authority of the Old Testament Scriptures

with the New, and as to the organic unity of the Scriptures Old and New, as forming together the one complete revelation of the divine will—might, in that case, have been regarded as virtually asserting that the Old Testament had ceased to be part of the rule of faith. But a theory that proclaims its harmony with the assertion of the equal inspiration, the co-ordinate authority, and the organic unity of the two parts of Scripture, cannot be suspected of any such tendency. Mr Smith over and over again asserts the sufficiency of the New Testament for all purposes alike of duty, faith, and worship. But, while doing this, he no less strenuously asserts, that “all the everlasting doctrine, and all the everlasting duty revealed in the old covenant, have been gathered up and expressed with greater clearness in the new covenant in Christ, so that not one jot or tittle of them is lost”—(p. 86, C.) Omitting any further reference to Mr Smith’s views regarding the relation of the Old Testament to the New, I now ask the attention of the Assembly to the second subject, on which the teaching of the sermons was regarded as erroneous, viz., the moral law and the Decalogue. 2. The view given by Mr Smith of the moral law and the Decalogue. Mr Smith’s language on this, as on the other subject, is far from being very precise; yet it has far less of extremeness about it than is found in the other case. It is not so difficult, therefore, to get at Mr Smith’s real meaning, although even that is not a little perplexed by some very unguarded assertions. Perhaps nothing has excited so strong a prejudice against his views on the moral law as the application to this law of his theory of fulfilling and thereby annulling. If fulfil means to abolish, what, it is asked, in alarm, comes of the moral law as the rule of life? In order to answer this question satisfactorily, it will be necessary to consider what precisely is meant by the abrogating or annulling of law. Men abrogate or annul laws, because it has either been found that the statute has been made in ignorance of the real facts of the case, or because experience has proved that the statute itself is not fitted to secure the end proposed. When, in either of these ways, it is discovered that the law does not secure the end for which it was called into existence, it is thrust out of existence, and is said to be abrogated or annulled. But in this sense no law of God, whether ceremonial, judicial, or moral, ever was, or can be, annulled. Whatever law God appoints is appointed in infinite wisdom and goodness. No want of knowledge or power leads Him to cancel any law that He has made. Whatever He ordains must run the course for which it was designed by Him. It must reach its appointed *terminus ad quem*. When therefore the Scripture speaks of an annulling, disannulling, and setting aside of laws which God had made, it can only be as expressing the fact that they had reached the end which the Lawgiver had appointed. In other words, the only way in which any law of God can be annulled is by its being fulfilled. Every divine law appointed as a provisional arrangement ceases when the end designed by it has been gained. It fulfils its destiny, and so it passes away. But moral law, being the reflection of God’s moral nature, is as unchangeable as the divine attributes are unchangeable. Moral law is not a tentative or provisional code, but an everlasting expression of the relations which men sustain to God and to their fellow-men—or, as Edwards would say, to *being in general*. When, therefore, Mr Smith speaks of Christ fulfilling,

and by fulfilling annulling the moral law, he cannot possibly mean that the moral law as such is set aside. To fulfil types is to abolish them. To fulfil the end designed by preparatory institutions is to abolish them. But to fulfil moral law—to fill all its channels of duty up to the full, is only to surround the law thus fulfilled with higher sanctions. Our Lord declares that He came not to destroy the law or the prophets, but to fulfil. And on the principle already explained, in fulfilling typical, ceremonial, or temporary laws, He actually abolished them, because the end for which they had been appointed was realised in Him. But in fulfilling the moral law, He surrounded all its requirements with higher sanctions, and thus bound all its separate parts more firmly together, revealing its oneness of spirit—the exceeding length and breadth of its demands, and thereby supplying new and additional motives to obedience. Thus Christ, in fulfilling the law, magnified the law. He did not bring in a new law, but threw a new sacredness, by throwing a new light, around that law that is the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever. And thus, through the power of this new light, and through the power of new motives, the authority of the law is exalted and man is blessed. I find nothing in Mr Smith's sermons or statements inconsistent with such principles as these, while there are several sentences that formally assert the very doctrines now stated. Thus (at p. 27, F) Mr Smith says :—“There is, of course, this difference between the proper moral law and the merely ceremonial, that while both alike are formally abolished, yet the special observances of the one are actually put an end to, while those of the other are really more binding than ever.” It is right that this distinction should be kept clearly in view, as it keeps the moral law out of the category of things that can be abolished, and makes Christ's fulfilment of the law surround it with higher sanctions. On this point Mr Smith has never wavered. From first to last, he has held the immutability of all divine moral law, and has represented it as exalted through its fulfilment in Christ. The point on which Mr Smith's views have diverged from those of his brethren, is not as to the nature and immutability of moral law, but as to the identity of the moral law and the Decalogue. The whole question is narrowed to this single issue :—Are the Decalogue and the moral law convertible terms? Or is there something of a distinctly moral nature that cannot be referred to any of the ten categories of the Decalogue? Mr Smith holds that the New Testament law of forgiveness and the law of mercy do not find any expression in the Decalogue, and on this account he declares that there is a greater fulness, as well as a greater inwardness, in the New Testament law of duty than existed in the Old. But, in holding this opinion, Mr Smith asserts nothing more than is asserted by Calvin in the extracts that I have already read from his works. And neither the Westminster Confession of Faith, nor the Catechisms, commit any one who subscribes them to any doctrine opposed to this. These standards declare that the Decalogue is an inspired summary of moral law, but they do not assert that the moral law and the Ten Commandments are equivalent expressions. It will not do, therefore, to say, as has more than once been said in connexion with this case in the inferior court, that the law of mercy is not in the Decalogue, because mercy is a thing peculiar to an economy that contemplates man as a fallen being, and therefore can find no expression in the one everlasting rule of duty. For, according to Paul,

the Decalogue, as a rule of righteousness, has as distinct a reference to man's fallen condition as the law of mercy can possibly have. But, apart from this explicit testimony of the apostle, it is manifest that if it be granted that the law of mercy is not found in the Decalogue, and yet that it is our duty to show mercy, there must be some sense in which it can be said that the unchanging moral law of God is of wider compass than the letter of the Ten Commandments. To admit that mercy is a duty, and to confess, at the same time, that it does not find expression in the Decalogue, because the Decalogue is the one immutable revelation of moral law, is unmistakably to surrender the citadel in the attempt to defend it. The statements in the Confession do not commit any one to a defence of this kind. All that they declare on this point is, that the moral law as given in the Decalogue is, for man in his present condition, a perfect rule of righteousness. The root-principles of all moral duty are there. But they are there in a form specially adapted to, and designed for, sinners. And this concession implies that the form in which the moral law is given in the Decalogue is not the form in which it was revealed to man in innocence, nor will it be the form in which the moral law will be revealed to the redeemed in heaven. It is perfectly consistent, therefore, with this view to say that the moral law and the Decalogue are not absolutely identical expressions. This interpretation receives additional confirmation from the words of the Catechisms bearing on this subject. Both Catechisms describe the moral law as summarily comprehended in the Ten Commandments. Now, if there is any meaning in words, a summary cannot be exactly co-extensive with the thing summarised; nor can a thing comprehending be exactly co-extensive with the thing comprehended. You cannot speak of two things that are exact equivalents being comprehended the one in the other. The compilers of our standards may be thus fairly held as declaring their belief in the greater fulness and inwardness of the New Testament revelation of duty, compared with what was given in the Old Testament. And while doing this, they could consistently speak of the Decalogue as a perfect rule of righteousness, because it is a perfect summary of that primeval revelation of duty that was stamped on man's nature. Professor Douglas (having concluded Mr Freer's paper) went on to say—In coming to a conclusion, I need not remind you that Mr Smith deserves some consideration on account of the frankness with which he has acted throughout, from the time that of his own accord he brought his sermons under our notice. But the Scriptures plainly teach that the object of Church power is edification and not destruction; and therefore I hold that our proceedings, to which we rightly give the name of discipline, are to be, if possible, of the nature of family training rather than of judicial trial and punishment. In this respect, I trust, it will be the opinion of this Assembly that enough has been done up to the point at which we continued unanimous. That unanimity among ourselves was a great matter, it might have been difficult of attainment, yet it was absolutely perfect; I believe it had a most blessed effect upon our Church members, and upon surrounding Churches. I think there is evidence enough that it had a happy effect upon Mr Smith, who submitted to our censure without appealing to the higher courts; and I should think that he himself will readily allow that his views upon these subjects are (to say the least) much clearer than when he first handled them in

these sermons whose teaching, in two particulars, we censured. I ask you to consider what risks there are in pressing to a decision what the Church has not defined? I sometimes think that the Churches which are perfectly free to act are exposed to a temptation incident to liberty, to press too far the prevailing opinion of the moment, and to deny toleration to unpopular opinions, though these lie fairly beyond the limits of their standards. But on this I cannot enlarge. The report from which we dissent insists upon Mr Smith retracting and disavowing. Why both? Why not one or other? Mr Smith has unhesitatingly disclaimed the doctrines at variance with the truths which he has confessed—doctrines which we thought natural inferences from his teaching. Is not this enough to us who have him entirely at our mercy if he were conceivably to break faith? Are we to insist that Mr Smith shall say he believed those doctrines were taught in these sermons, after he has told us that he believes they were not? If he had at first withdrawn the sermons, at that time when, in the beginning of his second statement, he expressed regret for using language which had given rise to distrust, and trouble, and misunderstanding (from which language our first report had deduced opinions which he declared he did not entertain)—I say, if he had so withdrawn these sermons at the first, I think it would have been the happiest course for us all. But, again and again he gave explanations of them, declaring that his meaning was not what we supposed it to be; and setting aside the sermons, which we have censured, I frankly declare myself satisfied with the doctrinal teaching which he has finally enunciated. I am not sure that I understand the process by which he reconciles some of the language of these sermons with his present doctrinal statements; I don't understand it, and therefore I think we did right in censuring, painful though it was to do so. But he has all along declared that he does hold the sermons and his present statements and the successive explanations to be in harmony, and therefore I do not see how he could retract without practically confessing that he had been dishonest in these explanations. I will be no party to such a proceeding. This would be to reverse what Scripture teaches of discipline, to make it for destruction and not for edification. And if you affirm the decision of the Presbytery, I venture, with all humility, to say that you will take a course not for the honour of the Church, nor for the confirmation of sound doctrine. You will send the case back to us, and bid us insist on retraction and disavowal. Of course Mr Smith will refuse; for at times I have doubted his logical exactness and his wisdom, but I have never doubted his probity and his sense of honour. When he refuses to retract, what can we do but resolve to serve a libel? And when we do so, it is my firm persuasion that his answers and explanations will be such that it will be impossible to prove it. The case will ignominiously break down, and not improbably the whole moral influence of our past dealing will be lost, if not to him, yet to the Christian community around us and to ourselves. (Loud applause.)

Dr BEGG, referring to the manifestation of feeling indulged in by a part of the audience, said that he thought it intolerable, and that it ought not to be allowed. This is (he added) a very solemn and serious case—one that requires the greatest patience, and a calm, judicial bearing on the part of those who have to consider and dispose of it; and it is highly improper for any one to manifest any feeling on either side.

Dr FORBES—I think that some ministers have engaged in this manifestation, and I especially regret to think that some of those in the Presbytery of Glasgow are to be included in this number.

Mr NIXON—The demonstration has been confined, I think, to one part of the house. The unseemly interruptions referred to came from a single gallery, (pointing to that occupied by the students,) where I have observed that a few lads, scarcely half-grown, are the offending parties. I have but to remind those parties that if there be any further manifestation of that kind, if any one will second the motion, I will move that that gallery be cleared. (Some hisses from the gallery referred to.)

Professor DOUGLAS said that, though he was anxious that the utmost silence should be observed while this case was under consideration, yet he would regret that they should be laid under any necessity to act as had been alluded to.

Dr CANDLISH said that, if there was any further noise from the gallery, they must have it cleared.

Dr FORBES then proceeded to address the Assembly in support of the judgment of the Presbytery. In doing so, he said—Moderator,—In defending the decision of the Presbytery, which has been impugned by the dissentients in this important case, it will be necessary to take a review of the previous proceedings of the Presbytery ; and it will be understood by the Assembly that the whole of these proceedings were adopted by the Presbytery with perfect unanimity, or at least without a single dissentient voice. This review, it is apprehended, will satisfy the Assembly that the decision impugned is the only consistent logical conclusion to which the Presbytery could possibly have arrived—that we were shut up to it by our previous decisions in the case—and that to have adopted the motion proposed and supported by the dissentients would have stultified the Presbytery, compromised the interests of divine truth, and have involved us in the imputation of countenancing a mode of expressing the obligation of the Decalogue, and the relation of the Old Testament Scriptures to the New, which the Presbytery had unanimously disapproved and censured as being at variance with the language of the Confession of Faith and the teaching of Scripture. The case came before the Presbytery, in the first instance, in a public manner, on the 2d day of May 1866, in consequence of a statement by Mr Smith to the effect that “he had become aware, though only by means of vague rumours, that certain statements of his on our Lord’s Sermon on the Mount had given offence to a small party in his session,” and he thereupon proceeded to give an explanation of his views with reference to the subjects respecting which he had been charged with delivering erroneous teaching in his discourses. The following extracts from that explanatory statement will show the General Assembly that the questions involved were of a most serious description, and such as not only justified the Presbytery, but rendered it imperatively necessary to institute the subsequent proceedings in the case. Mr Smith, evidently with a view to protect himself from an inference to the contrary, which the Presbytery would almost unavoidably draw from the theory which he proceeded to propound respecting the supercession of the authority of the Old Testament Scriptures, stated :—“I hold firmly by the apostle’s saying, that ‘all Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doc-

trine, for reproof, for correction, and for instruction in righteousness." He then proceeds to state—

"But now, coming to the real question at issue, allow me to say that all those Old Testament Scriptures, whatever of eternal truth they might and did contain, were at least formally connected with a dispensation which has assuredly passed away, and it appeared to me that in that sense, as the formal regulative documents of the present economy, they have been superseded by the New Testament, which is now itself the authoritative and sufficient revelation of God's will to us, as to all matters of doctrine, worship, and duty."

Mr Smith evidently limits the administration of the covenant of grace during the period embraced under the Old Testament to one dispensation: whereas, the Confession of Faith expressly states that "one and the same" covenant has been administered under various dispensations. We are, accordingly, accustomed to distinguish the patriarchal dispensation, and the Abrahamic dispensation, and the Mosaic dispensation, as differing from each other and from the Christian dispensation; but as all severally combining to one and the same end, the exhibition and administration of the covenant of grace, which is as much the substance of the Old Testament as the New. That we are doing no injustice to Mr Smith in ascribing to him an oversight on this subject, and one which involves much of the erroneous teaching into which he has fallen, appears from the following passage in his statement:—"It appeared necessary to determine, if possible, the precise relation between the Old Testament and the New. And the question presented itself to me in this light. There are two dispensations—the one less clearly, and the other more fully, setting forth the mind and will of God for our salvation; yet both so closely allied that the first did figure and foreshadow its successor, which last again fulfilled all the promise of the earlier covenant. These two dispensations I found embodied in two different sets of documents, both alike divinely inspired, therefore both claiming the same authority. But it was clear that the one dispensation had superseded the other; and therefore it seemed to me equally clear that, in some sense, the one set of inspired documents must be assumed to have come in the room of the previous set. The laws which regulated the first economy could not remain in force, side by side with those of the New Testament; and yet the Lord had plainly said He had not come to destroy the law and the prophets, but to fulfil them."

The summary, and, we may add, the indiscriminate way in which Mr Smith decides that the authority of the Old Testament Scriptures has been entirely superseded by the New, contrasts very remarkably with the exceedingly guarded, careful, and elaborate disquisitions of the most eminent divines upon the distinction between what was ordained to be permanent in the Old Testament, and what was merely temporary.

"It is a matter of the greatest moment," says Witsius, "that we learn distinctly to consider the covenant of grace either as it is in its substance or essence, as they call it, or as it is in diverse ways proposed by God with respect to circumstantials under different economies. If we view the substance of the covenant, it is but only one, nor is it possible it could be otherwise. There is no other way worthy of God in which salvation can be bestowed on sinners, but that discovered in the gospel, whence the apostle (Gal. i. 7) has beautifully said, 'which is not an-

other ;' and that testament which was consecrated by the blood of Christ he calls everlasting, (Heb. xiii. 20,) because it was settled from eternity, published immediately upon the fall of the first man, constantly handed down by the ancients, more fully explained by Christ himself and His apostles, and is to continue throughout all ages, and in virtue of which believers shall inherit eternal happiness. But if we attend to the circumstances of the covenant, it was dispensed at 'sundry times and in divers manners,' under various economies, for the manifestation of the manifold wisdom of God. In considering this, we are first to discourse on those general things which pertain to the substance of the covenant, and have continued in every age ; and then explain the different economies or dispensations, and the new accessions made to each, which we will first do in a general and concise manner, then gradually descend to the more special considerations."

Now, it shows the indiscriminate and unsparing extent to which Mr Smith carries out his theory with respect to the supercession of the authority of the Old Testament Scriptures by the New, that he expressly includes the Decalogue as being superseded. His words are—"I apprehend that the form in which unchanging moral duty is laid down to us may, to some extent vary, and that it may be revealed at one time in greater fulness than it was previously understood to be. That changed form, then, and that fuller expression of its meaning, will henceforth be the law to us. It was in this sense that I spoke of the Decalogue as being in a manner superseded. The ceremonial law is fulfilled and annulled in Christ, so that it is no longer obligatory. But the moral law is fulfilled or filled up in such a way that it appears altogether more supremely excellent, and tenfold more binding than ever. The form of that law, as it is now revealed in Christ, is the form which is now obligatory upon us ; but that, instead of relaxing its authority, has, I believe, greatly exalted it, both in that its claims now rest on God's redeeming love and sacrifice, also in that its deep meaning, and spirituality, and holiness are better understood than they were under the former economy."

An eminent divine has been referred to by Professor Jas. Douglas as favouring the idea of the abrogation of the moral law under the gospel ; but I may observe, in reply to what he has said in regard to him, that no theological writer was perhaps ever more resolute in defending the doctrine of free grace than Calvin, or more eloquent in maintaining the divine honour of the Saviour and His divine offices, and so far was he, as appeared to be hinted to-day, from conceding to the theory of those who maintained that the Decalogue was abrogated by the gospel, that he denounced it and its abettors in terms of unmeasured condemnation. In Book II., Institutes, chap. 7, occurs a passage which may be translated as follows :—

"That the whole subject may be made manifest, the better let us combine, in a succinct order, the office and use of the law which is called moral. So far as I understand, that consists of three parts. The first is, that it displays to us the righteousness of God, or, in other words, that righteousness which alone God will accept, and by this means it admonishes, certifies, convinces, and condemns every individual of his own unrighteousness. The second office of the law is, that those who are not reached with any anxiety about what is right and just, unless

by compulsion, may be restrained from wickedness, at least, by the dread of punishment, when they hear, by means of the law, the dire penalties incurred by disobedience. In both these respects, that which is elsewhere spoken is applicable to the law, viz., that it is a schoolmaster to bring men to Christ; for there are two descriptions of persons whom it leads to Christ, as by the hand of a schoolmaster—those who are excessively filled with reliance upon their personal virtue or righteousness; and those who stand in need to be restrained as with a bridle, lest their sinful impulses should utterly extinguish all zeal for righteousness. The third use of the law, which is both its principal one and also the use which has a special respect to its proper end, is that which it serves in the case of believers, in whose hearts the Spirit of God acts and reigns. For, although they have the law written and engraven upon their hearts by the finger of God, that is, are so influenced and animated through the guidance of the Spirit, that their desire is to obtemper, or to be obedient to God, nevertheless they derive a twofold advantage from the law. It is the best of all means whereby they can learn better and more surely, day by day, than by any other, what the will of God is which they aspire to, and are confirmed in the understanding of it. And further, inasmuch as we stand in need, not only of knowledge, but of exhortation, the servant of God will derive this advantage from the law, that he shall be stimulated to obedience by frequent meditation upon it, and shall therein be strengthened and kept at a distance from the lubricity of a course of delinquency.”

After descanting upon these three topics, Calvin adds, sec. 13 :—

“Whereas ignorant and unskilful persons cannot discern these things, they fiercely explode the authority of Moses *in toto*, and bid farewell to the tables of the law, because, forsooth, they deem it foreign to the position and condition of Christians to adhere to a teaching which contains the administration of death. Let such a profane sentiment be banished far from our minds; for Moses has admirably shown that the law which engenders death to sinners has a better and more excellent use to serve to saints; for he said to the people, when about to die, ‘Set your hearts unto all the words which I testify among you this day, which ye shall command your children to observe to do; all the words of the law, for it is not a vain thing for you, because it is your life; and through this ye shall prolong your days in the land, whither ye go over Jordan to possess it.’”

With reference to the statement of Mr Smith, that the form of the moral law in which it is revealed in Christ is the form which is now binding on us, it may be asked, Where does such a form exist? Christ evidently dealt not with the form, but with the spirit of the law, and, without altering its form one jot or tittle, exhibited the comprehensiveness, the spirituality, the holiness, and the unchangeableness of its precepts. There is nothing analogous to the Decalogue in the New Testament; and teach men that the Decalogue has lost its authority, you leave them at large to find out their duty by constructing a form of law for themselves; in which case the form they adopt will necessarily quadrate with and become as various as their several idiosyncrasies, moral and intellectual. At any rate, the authority of any form thus deduced from the New Testament will not be “thus saith the Lord,” but it can only amount to this: such, according to my reading of the New Testa-

ment, is the will of the Lord. And I cannot but think that Mr Smith has unconsciously indicated this feature of his theory, when he says, "that changed form and that fuller expression of its meaning will henceforth be the law to us;" indicating that its authority shall be conditional on the approbation of the recipient of the form, and not absolutely and unconditionally imperative because of the nomothetical prerogative of the divine law. A modern writer, who has supplied the article *Law* in Kitto's Cyclopædia of Biblical Literature, contends for this as the liberty and progress which the Church enjoys from the gospel. His words are—

"It was necessary that the law of Moses should exercise nomothetical authority by 'Cursed is he who does not continue in the words of the law;' and so it is with a great portion of Christian religionists, who still require frightful curses and opposite benedictions, somewhat similar to those pronounced on the mountains Ebal and Gerizim, in order to keep them in the right direction. It is very surprising that the clear perception of the true source of law, which was fulfilled even by the abrogation, could have been so effectually obscured as is done by the doctrine current in the religious world concerning the abolition of its civil and ceremonial, and the establishment of its moral precepts. The whole aim and scope of the Mosaic legislation have been established as much as the aim of temporary police regulations enacted in order to meet the emergencies of a commonwealth during a period of rebellion, is established and fulfilled by him who restores perfect peace and tranquillity, although the natural consequence of this peace is that those regulations cease to be in force. On the other hand, although the Christian, who is under the guidance of a Spirit leading him into all truth, cannot be led by this Spirit to the commission of any crime contrary to the moral precepts of Moses, it cannot be said that by not committing murder and adultery he obeys the Mosaic law, any more than that he obeys the injunctions of the Code Napoleon in these particular instances."

Before passing from this part of the subject, I cannot but advert to the depreciatory strictures which Mr Smith has made on the First and Fourth Commandments as contained in the Decalogue, compared with the mode in which they reappear in the New Testament:—

"The form of that, (the moral law,) as it is now revealed in Christ, is the form which is now obligatory upon us; but that, instead of relaxing its authority, has, I believe, greatly exalted it, both in that its claims now rest on God's redeeming love and sacrifice, and also in that its deep meaning, and spirituality, and holiness, are better understood than they were under the former economy. Thus, for example, the form of the First Commandment simply asserts the unity of the Godhead, and requires us to worship Him alone. But that law, when it reappears in the New Testament, changes its form very materially; for the unity of the Godhead becomes a trinity of persons in the one God, and the Christian is bound to worship alike Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; nor can he keep the law aright without reference to that great mystery. Again, in the Fourth Commandment, I recognise three elements. There is, first, a moral element—that a portion of time should be expressly set apart for divine worship; and, second, a positive element, appointing a seventh day for that purpose; and, finally, a monumental element, for

a particular day of the seven was fixed on to commemorate the finished work of creation. Now, when this law reappears in the New Testament, the moral and the positive parts remain as before—the duty is recognised of having a set time for worship, and the one day in seven is the same as heretofore. But the precise day is changed, because it was no longer to be a monument of creation, but a memorial of the resurrection of Jesus. It is, therefore, in this form and with this view, it remains an abiding duty and privilege to all Christian men. On the authority of the apostles, therefore, we keep the first day of the week, and we do so in memory of the risen Lord.”

Now, we advert to this passage, because it shows the dangerous results of Mr Smith's theory, which can be maintained only by magnifying one portion of the inspired Word of God at the expense of another; by conjuring up discrepancies which have their origin in ignorance or prejudice, and by neglecting that unity and harmony which pervade the holy Scriptures, and which necessarily distinguish them as being given by inspiration of God. The First Commandment has evidently for its object to enjoin the exclusive worship of God, and to prohibit polytheism; but to argue that it ignores the doctrine of the Trinity, and is not adapted to the Christian dispensation, is an utter misapprehension of its import. A similar objection might be urged of an equally futile nature against the teaching of the New Testament. “God is a Spirit, and they that worship Him must worship Him in spirit and in truth.” In each case, observe, the divine perfection is expressed, which forms the foundation for the commandment: in the one case the unity of the Godhead, and in the other the spirituality of the Godhead. But it is absurd to charge this as an imperfection in either case, and to maintain that the whole doctrine concerning the Godhead required to have been adduced, in order that the law should, to use the expression of Mr Smith, be “filled up.” With regard to the Fourth Commandment, so far is it in the estimation of many individuals from reappearing in the New Testament in a form which, instead of relaxing its authority, has greatly exalted it, that the very opposite is the case; and we shall here quote the conclusions to which so eminent a student of Scripture as Dr Paley came upon the subject, as corroborative of our statements, (vol. iv. p. 301):—

“The opinion that Christ and His apostles meant to retain the duties of the Jewish Sabbath, shifting only the day from the seventh to the first, seems to prevail without sufficient proof; nor does any evidence remain in Scripture (of what, however, is not improbable) that the first day of the week was thus distinguished in commemoration of our Lord's resurrection. The conclusion from the whole inquiry is this—The assembling upon the first day of the week for the purpose of public worship and religious instruction is a law of Christianity of Divine appointment: the resting on that day from our employments longer than we are detained from them by attendance upon the assemblies, is to Christians *an ordinance of human institution*, binding, nevertheless, upon the conscience of every individual of a country in which a weekly Sabbath is instituted for the sake of the beneficent purposes which the public and regular observance of it promotes, and recommended, perhaps, in some degree to the divine approbation by the resemblance it bears to what God was pleased to make a solemn part of the law which he de-

livered to the people of Israel, and by its subserviency to many of the same uses."

The committee of Presbytery, having heard the statement of Mr Smith, upon which we have commented, were unanimously of opinion that a committee be appointed to confer with Mr Smith on the document now read and the sermons to which it relates, and to report to the *in hunc effectum* meeting on the 10th current. The report of the committee was laid on the table on that day, and the meeting adjourned to the 22d May, to allow opportunity to print the report, the discourses of Mr Smith, and his first statement. The report is found in the printed proceedings; but the only portions of it to which we shall refer in the present instance are the following:—

"The committee are unanimously of opinion that the teaching (of the sermons) is at variance on two important points with that of Scripture itself, as well as with the view set forth in the Confession. First, in regard to the moral law; this Scripture and the Confession alike represent as essentially embodied in the Decalogue, and as the same in spirit and extent of obligation for those who lived in Old Testament as for those who live now in New Testament times. The teaching of the Confession on this point admits of no doubt, and that of the New Testament Scripture seems equally explicit. Not a word is said there of the law's inherent imperfections, of its outwardness, of its being good only so far as it went; but a good deal is said of the guilt and folly of those who looked merely to the outward letter, and did not seek to penetrate into the spirit of its requirements."

This statement has been animadverted upon at the bar to-day as being unauthorised; but it must be recollected that this is a report drawn up by Professor Fairbairn, and which received the full accord of the Presbytery. The second portion of the report to which we wish to direct attention is stated thus:—"The teaching in these passages (Rom. vii. 7-12, xiii. 8-10; Gal. v. 14, &c.) as to the perfection of the moral law embodied in the Decalogue, and the everlasting obligation of its principles and precepts, are so clear and decisive, that no room could possibly be left for any advance under the gospel, except in regard to a further unfolding by teaching or example of its motives or obligations, or to the promise of larger grace to aid in discharging them." Let me now, Moderator, bring into juxtaposition with this branch of the report the reply which Mr Smith made to it in his second statement; and in so doing I beg to request the particular attention of the General Assembly to this question—Does the reply accord with, or does it not rather controvert in the strongest manner, the second and third reasons which the dissentients have assigned for dropping the case?—

"Because the erroneous opinions, which in the judgment of the Presbytery, the sermons were fitted to teach has been explicitly disavowed, and the opposite truths confessed in language which is in entire harmony with the standards of the Church;" "Because, after his distinct repudiation of said errors, to exact any formal retraction of the statements of the sermons seems to the complainers at once unnecessary, unreasonable, and harsh."

We appeal to Mr Smith's reply as the refutation of these reasons, and as demonstrating in the most unequivocal and explicit manner that he did not disavow the erroneous opinions which the sermons were fitted

to teach, nor confess the opposite truths in language which is in entire harmony with the standards of the Church. The passages in proof of this you will find in the papers—

“Now, Sir, allow me to say that on this head”—viz., the perfection of the moral law embodied in the Decalogue, and the everlasting obligation of its principles and precepts—“I have no complaint to make of being misunderstood. Calmly but firmly, and with all respect for the brethren of your committee, I take the liberty of differing from them here. I hold that there is a greater fulness of moral law revealed by Christ and His apostles than was revealed by Moses and the prophets. It is not contradictory, but it is more complete. In substance they both agree, but in perfection they are contrasted.”

This language, we submit, with all respect for the dissentients, is neither in harmony with Scripture nor the subordinate standards of the Church. What says Scripture?—“The law of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul.” What says the Confession of Faith, (chap. xix. sec. 11)?—“This law, after his fall, continued to be a perfect rule of righteousness, and as such was delivered by God upon Mount Sinai, in ten commandments, and written on two tables.” The next passage in which Mr Smith declares that he neither did nor could concur in the views set forth by the committee of Presbytery in their report, is:—

“But on this head I am constrained to take even somewhat higher ground, for indeed this is the very heart and pith of the whole matter. Were the question at issue merely one regarding the form of truth, I should not care to hold long debates about it, important as in some circumstances it certainly might be. Were it, as has been said, a question of getting rid of the Decalogue with one hand, and restoring it with the other, I should feel all the contempt proper for the paltry shifts of a supersubtle ingenuity. But this is verily a ‘matter which concerns the King.’ I believe that it is bound up with the true idea of Christ’s prophetic office, as declared pre-eminently in His personal ministry on earth, and therefore it is to my mind of such unspeakable value that it is worth, and far more than worth, any sacrifice I may have to make for it. For you will observe, Sir, that according to the theory laid down by your committee, and on which rests their condemnation of my discourses, all the laws of moral duty were really and fully revealed to ancient Israel, so that no proper addition could possibly be made to them. The people might obscure them by their tradition, and that might require to be removed, like the gathered rust and dust of unspiritual ages; or they might fail to see all the meaning and bearing of them, and hence it might be necessary, at some stages, to shed a stronger light upon these precepts; or they might be defective in the necessary impulse of constraining motive, and that would require to be strengthened. But the law itself, as to all moral duty, is held to be complete, incapable of increase, of deeper meaning, of greater fulness in any one field of human obligation. Here, then, I distinctly, yet most respectfully, join issue with those brethren. There is no doubt that we differ also on a most important point. For this view clearly reduces the prophetic work of Christ, and His personal ministry here on earth, so far, at least, as moral duty is concerned, to that of a mere interpreter, expositor, or commentator, such as the other prophets between Moses and Jesus. Now, we are told by the great legislator of Israel himself, that this was not the sole function which the Messiah was to fulfil. He

says—‘The Lord thy God will raise up unto you a Prophet, from the midst of my brethren, *like unto me*, unto him shall ye hearken.’ But the long line of prophetic men who succeeded Moses, in the history of Israel, were not *like unto him*. They were not legislators, they were only expositors. They did not give law, they only interpreted and enforced it. If, therefore, Jesus did no more, He was like unto them, He was not like unto Moses; and therein His peculiar character, as the one successor of Moses, the heir of all, and more than all, his authority is brought into imminent jeopardy. For whatever general principles of all morality may be thought to be discoverable in the Old Testament, as read now by us, on whom the ends of the earth have come, the code introduced by Jesus, taken in its entirety, was so much larger, higher, and grander in its unfolding of the one Divine and Eternal law, as to be substantially a piece of new legislation, without which, some of the specific duties it enjoins could never have been known at all to be obligatory; while, perhaps, all moral duty without it would have failed to attain that profound spirituality which it is at least certain the New Testament demands.”

We cordially concur in the statement that this is a matter “touching the King.” For what touches more closely the honour and authority of a king, and his claim to the cordial love and obedience of his subjects, than the excellence pertaining to the law of his kingdom. The law given from Sinai, in circumstances of overwhelming solemnity, was given by the Divine King and Head of the Church, Jesus Christ, and to impress it with more sacred authority, it was engraven on tables of stone, and communicated with that special dignity which belongs to an autograph. To represent Jesus as “the successor of Moses, and the heir of all, and more than all, his authority,” is to make the Son of God inferior to one of His own servants, and is at variance with the whole tenor of Scripture teaching with respect to the relation between Christ and every other servant of God, angelic and human. But the case at present in dependence lies between the Presbytery and the dissentients, and the immediate question therefore is, Did Mr Smith’s statement authorise the dissentients to aver that he disavowed the erroneous opinions in the sermons, and confessed the opposite truths? In the second branch of their report, the committee and Presbytery charge Mr Smith with exhibiting in his discourses a view of the relation of Old Testament Scriptures to the New, which appears to conflict with Scripture and the Confession, “as if, instead of being component parts of one great whole, neither being alone complete, the one must of necessity give way to the other, and lose all strictly authoritative value and binding power when the closing revelations had come.” What reply did Mr Smith give to this charge? Did he resile from it, and confess the opposite truth? So far from this, he reaffirmed his previous statement on the subject in express terms:—

“Admitting, then, the delicacy and difficulty of this point, I might simply repeat the statement which I already made to the Presbytery in regard to it—the purport of which was to this effect, that the New Testament Scriptures are now the dominant regulative principles of that economy under which we live, and consequently supply us with a test—the only decisive and satisfactory test—by which to determine what of the Old Testament is yet binding upon us.” Also—“Always, however, I

must bring the ancient Scriptures to the test supplied by the words of the Lord and His apostles. They are not binding on me without that sanction. In whatever respect they differ from the New Testament, I say that belongs to an economy which has now passed away. Where they lay down injunctions or express emotions which do not accord with the spirit of the New Testament, of these, also, I say, they belong to an economy which has now passed away. Or when they ordain anything which is not distinctly laid down or fairly implied in the New Testament, I have still no guiding principle but that on which I can rely, and I conclude that all such injunctions belong to an economy which has now passed away."

Clearly this passage implied that Divine law, like human law, is annulable without any express authoritative sanction to that effect on the ground of desuetude, and because it has not been re-enacted. But the Saviour expressly confutes that opinion in the verse succeeding the text; His words are—"Verily I say unto you, till heaven and earth pass, one jot or tittle shall in no wise pass from the law till all be fulfilled." The opposite principle from that laid down by Mr Smith has obtained the consent and adoption of all intelligent commentators upon the Scriptures, viz., that every precept contained in the Old Testament Scriptures is binding upon our faith and practice, unless a distinct repeal can be produced by which it has been annulled and abrogated. The Presbytery reappointed the committee, and remitted to them the documents on which they had already reported, together with the written statement now quoted from, and instructed the committee to consider and report as to the course which it may be proper and necessary that the Presbytery, in further prosecuting this grave and important case, should pursue. Accordingly, the committee continued their diligence in the case, and gave in a further report. The deliverance which the committee suggested to the Presbytery in that report was unanimously adopted, and is as follows:—

"(1.) That the two discourses of Mr Smith be disapproved and censured, as containing statements regarding the moral law and the Old Testament Scriptures which are at variance with the language of the Confession and the teaching of Scripture. (2.) That the two explanatory papers read by Mr Smith cannot be regarded as satisfactory explanations of the statements contained in the discourses on the points in question."

It is important to observe that this motion was made by Dr Fairbairn, one of the dissentients; and was, I believe, not only silently acquiesced in, but cordially approved by the others; so that, at least up to this period of the proceedings, they saw no reason for saying that Mr Smith had explicitly disavowed the erroneous opinions which, in the judgment of the Presbytery, the sermons were fitted to teach, and had confessed the opposite truth in language that is in entire harmony with the standards of the Church; but much reason had they for saying, as they did, the very reverse. The adoption of Mr Smith's theory about the supersession of the Old Testament Scriptures by the New Testament, so that they are not binding on our faith and practice without the sanction of the latter, would revolutionise the whole of our theology from its first elements to its highest conclusions. It would require that the Shorter Catechism be remodelled, and that the answer to the ques-

tion, "What rule hath God given to direct us how we may glorify and enjoy Him?" should run in some such terms as the following:—"The Word of God contained in the Old Testament, which was formerly the rule, has been annulled and abrogated, having been a mere draft or provisional will; and the New Testament is the only rule to direct us how we may glorify and enjoy Him." Also, it would require that the answer to the question—"Where is the moral law summarily comprehended?" should be in some such terms as these—"The moral law was formerly summarily comprehended in the Ten Commandments; but it has been discovered that the Ten Commandments are not identical with the moral law, and the moral law, therefore, is summarily comprehended nowhere—(loud laughter)—for the New Testament is now the one authoritative document expressing the whole will of God, containing a far deeper and broader law of moral duty than that which was engraven on the tables of stone." And that solemn question put to ministers and all office-bearers at their ordination—"Do you believe the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament to be the Word of God and the only rule of faith and manners?" would require to be altered, in adaptation to Mr Smith's theory, to some form of this nature—"Do you believe the Old Testament Scriptures to have been given by inspiration of God, and to be now annulled, abrogated, and superseded by the New Testament?" (Laughter.) "Do you at the same time believe that no principle or law essentially moral can ever be abrogated, and do you believe that the New Testament is the Word of God to us, and the only rule of faith and manners?" When these practical conclusions are looked at, which unavoidably follow from Mr Smith's statements, what else could the Presbytery do, but declare, as they did, that the discourses be disapproved and censured, and that Mr Smith's explanations are unsatisfactory? The next step in the proceedings consisted in the Presbytery adopting a motion made by Dr Fairbairn, seconded by Dr Buchanan, two of the dissentients, to propose two questions to Mr Smith, with a view to test his views as to the immutable and universal obligation of the Decalogue, and the permanent authority of the Old Testament Scriptures as a rule of faith and manners, with the exception of those portions of it which relate to the ceremonial and judicial law, which the New Testament declares to be no longer binding under the Christian dispensation. These questions are as follow:—

"I. Do the Ten Commandments, as given from Sinai, and summed up in the two great precepts of perfect love to God and brotherly love to man, contain a revelation of the law of God binding on Christians, and one that is comprehensive of all moral duty?"

"II. Are the Scriptures of the Old Testament, (with the requisite allowance for what is stated in the Confession as to 'ceremonial and judicial statutes') still authoritative in themselves for the establishment of doctrine and the inculcation of moral duty, irrespective of every fresh sanction or enforcement of them in the New Testament?"

Mr Smith's answers to these questions are now to be considered; but previous to an examination of their direct bearing upon the questions, it is important to remark that Mr Smith replies to an entirely different question from those proposed to him by the Presbytery, viz., the question whether the moral law is of perpetual obligation—

"I might not unreasonably complain that these interrogations have

been framed in such a way as to create a *prima facie* prejudice against me. I do not say whether this was intentional or not ; but this I do know, that over and over again I have asserted the perpetual obligation of all moral law ; and yet, in the face of clear written statements and explicit oral replies, these questions still suggest the odious insinuation that it is matter of doubt and uncertainty whether I have taught and whether I believe in the abiding laws of moral duty. I think I am entitled to complain of this kind of treatment."

Upon these observations, it is submitted, that they were neither called for nor justified by the questions proposed to Mr Smith, which related exclusively to the nature and perpetual obligation of the Ten Commandments as being comprehensive of all moral duty and binding on Christians, and to the intrinsic abiding authority of the Scriptures of the Old Testament as a divine rule of faith and manners, with the exception of ceremonial rites and civil ordinances. And as the abstract question of the perpetual obligation of moral law was never raised by the Presbytery as one upon which they entertained any doubts respecting Mr Smith's views, it is further submitted that the very decided, and in so far satisfactory, reply which he has given upon that question, is wholly irrelevant to the matters in dependence between him and the Presbytery, and cannot be adopted as in the least affecting the merits of the case. The soundness of the teaching of a moral philosopher is one thing, and the soundness of the teaching of a Christian minister is a very different thing—(hear, hear)—because the latter embraces the demonstration and vindication, not of morality in the abstract, but of the morality of divine revelation, and of its possession of that unchangeable and perpetual obligation which is the intrinsic quality of all moral truth. What the Presbytery intended to ascertain was, whether Mr Smith did adhere to the following statements, or others of similar import, in his sermons, or did not :—

"But it was not His (the Lord Jesus Christ's) mission simply to revive it (the old law of Moses, moral, ceremonial, and judicial) in its old purity, and to restore its ancient power. It was His purpose to bring from the same Father of Lights a kindred, but fuller and more glorious law, which should be to the ancient economy as the splendour of the morning sun is to the twinkling of the midnight lamp. So He fulfilled the ancient Scriptures, and, in that very fact, annulled them. We are no longer under their economy, but under the great truth which came by Jesus Christ. That New Testament contains in itself, and without mixture or addition from any other quarter whatsoever, the complete revelation of God's will for our salvation—the whole truth we are to believe—the whole law we are to obey—the whole rites of divine worship—the entire covenant of our redemption. As the servants of Christ, we administer only its provisions. As the heirs of God, we get our inheritance only according to its appointment. It is the one now authoritative document for determining His purpose ; and it holds this high and exclusive power just because it has fulfilled, and, in fulfilling, has abrogated the entire Old Testament dispensation."

Now, the subject with which we have to do is simply this, Did Mr Smith's answers to the two questions proposed to him by the Presbytery give any ground for the reasons assigned by the dissentients for giving up the case, or did they not—in other words, did he in these answers

disavow explicitly the erroneous opinions which, in the judgment of the Presbytery, the sermons were fitted to teach, and confess the opposite truths in language that is in entire harmony with the standards of the Church? That he did no such thing clearly appears by referring to his answers :—

“Looking at the matter, then, in that light, I am constrained to say that, profound and comprehensive as the Decalogue is, it does not cover all the ground embraced in the two great precepts of perfect love to God and brotherly love to men.”

This, it is submitted, is in express terms a negative to the first question, and declares that the Ten Commandments do not contain a revelation of the law of God comprehensive of all moral duty. To the same effect is the following :—

“Allowing, as it is surely impossible not to allow, that the Decalogue does not by itself fill up the whole idea of moral duty, it may be said that what appears to be omitted from the tables of stone, will, however, be found in other parts of the Sinaitic legislation. I am, therefore, constrained further to say, that while that is no doubt in some measure true, yet that code as a whole did not carry out to the full extent of its manifold application the great law of love which it certainly laid down.”

And further, as the summing up of the views which Mr Smith holds, and his final answer to the first question :—

“That the moral law is always and unchangeably binding ; that it is briefly but absolutely comprehended in the two precepts enjoining perfect love to God, and brotherly love to men ; that the Ten Commandments contain a weighty summary of moral duty, and *in so far* are perpetually binding ; but that neither does the Decalogue nor the entire Mosaic code fully express and apply the idea of perfect love to God and brotherly love to men.”

It is impossible to regard these statements in any other light than as explicit, reiterated declarations on the part of Mr Smith that he holds by the teaching of his sermons with respect to the Decalogue, as delivered in various places, and in particular as follows :—

“It is granted at once that under very diverse forms there was to be and is an essential unity in both these dispensations. It is fully admitted that the divine will, imperfectly indicated in the one Testament, is embraced and far more clearly expressed in the other. There are changes—indeed, some of them, as we have seen, even affecting moral principles ; for the first covenant was given to a people who were not prepared for the fulness of the truth, and therefore we are told that because of the hardness of their hearts God suffered some things which are no longer permitted ; but it is essential to our argument that all the real principles of moral rectitude and spiritual truth contained in the Old Testament are with added clearness and completeness carried forward into the New. The one is the draft or preparatory will ; the other is the perfect and final deed, by which the former is at once thoroughly fulfilled, and also for ever annulled.”

With regard to the second question proposed by the Presbytery to Mr Smith, his answer is explicit, to the effect that the Scriptures of the “Old Testament are not now authoritative in themselves for the establishment of doctrine and the inculcation of moral duty, except in so far as

they derive sanction and enforcement from the New Testament." In proof of this, read—

"But in the words of one of the greatest divines of his age, which I am permitted to use on this occasion, I hold that 'there are in the Old Testament some things that are temporal, and some things that are eternal, and that the *touchstone of the eternal is the legislation of Christ*. In this sense, all the Old Testament Scriptures—that is to say, all the positive enactments there laid down, and all that is illustrative of those enactments, with their various limitations of a free, moral, and catholic obedience—have been annulled, forasmuch as they are entirely subordinated to the New Testament, from which alone we learn what of the former Scriptures is abiding, and what has passed away." Again—"I hold that the Old Testament Scriptures are quite a sufficient authority for establishing any clear and undeniably spiritual truth, seeing that this abrogation does not affect such revelation at all—that they are also sufficient authority for establishing any moral duty, seeing that moral duty carries its reasons in itself, and is therefore binding whenever, and wherever, and by whomsoever uttered; but all the positive law contained in the Old Testament is annulled, and all the illustrations of it which might chance to be authoritative examples to us are also annulled, except in so far as they are reaffirmed in the New Testament, which, at the same time, does reaffirm all the spiritual truth, and all the moral obligation which had been aforetime revealed through Moses." Unquestionably the intrinsic divine authority of the Old Testament Scriptures is explicitly denied in these passages; for it is plainly stated that they are not binding upon us, except in so far only as they are corroborated and sanctioned by the New Testament Scriptures. This is manifestly a purely rationalistic view of the subject; for it depends entirely upon the opinion of an individual what, and how much, of the Old Testament Scriptures possess this corroboration and sanction; and what and how much therefore possesses divine legislative authority. As already stated, Mr Smith finds the Fourth Commandment to reappear in the New Testament in a form which, instead of relaxing its authority, has greatly exalted it. But Dr Paley does not find the Fourth Commandment in the New Testament at all. The question between them relates to one of exegesis, and which of the two is the best and soundest interpreter of the New Testament, and the divine obligation of the Fourth Commandment is ignored; the inquiry being thus relegated to the category of those subjects to which the apostle refers, "which minister questions rather than godly edifying which is in faith." The exegetical canon which Mr Smith parades with so much pomposity as an oracle of wisdom for which we are indebted to one of the greatest divines of this age, and which he has been graciously permitted by him to use, has, I am persuaded, been held as a theological axiom as far back as they can remember by every student, not to say every minister, of our Church. Who ever doubted that some things in the Old Testament Scriptures are temporary, and others eternal, and that the legislation of Christ is the touchstone which distinguishes the one from the other? But this principle avails nothing in favour of Mr Smith's theory, until he has demonstrated that the Ten Commandments have been placed by the legislation of Christ in the category of things which are temporary and which He has abrogated and annulled. To establish this will re-

quire something more than the authority of Mr Smith; for we have the testimony of Chrysostom on our side, who knew his native Greek language infinitely better than the most accomplished scholar of modern times, and who, in one of his discourses on the very text which Mr Smith has adopted in his discourses, defends and maintains the doctrine generally held upon the subject in the following decisive terms:—

“Where He (Christ) said, ‘Do not think that I came to destroy the law; I have not come to destroy, but to fulfil,’ that declaration not only laid a check upon the forwardness of the Jews, but it likewise sealed up the lips of heretics, who alleged that the old law was from the devil. For if Christ came to destroy his tyranny, on what account did He not destroy the law, but even fulfil it? For He not merely said, ‘I do not destroy,’ which certainly had been sufficient, but He likewise added, ‘I fulfil,’ which indicated that He was not only no adversary of the law, but was a defender of it. And in what way, do you ask, did He not destroy but fulfil the law or the prophets? The prophets He fulfilled, because He confirmed by His works all things that had been spoken by them; wherefore, the evangelist says, in respect of each of the following particulars, that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet, viz., when He was born, also when the children chanted that admirable hymn respecting Him, also when He entered into Jerusalem riding upon an ass, also in many other particulars did He fulfil the prophets, all of which would never have been fulfilled unless He had come. The law, indeed, He fulfilled, not in one way only, but also in a second, and even in a third. In one way, indeed, because He never transgressed in anything what possessed legal authority, but fulfilled the whole law; for hearken to what He said to John, ‘Thus it becomes us to fulfil all righteousness,’ and to what He said to the Jews, ‘Which of you accuses me of sin?’ and again to His disciples, ‘The prince of this world cometh and hath nothing in me.’ Therefore, in this first way, He fulfilled the law. In a second way He likewise fulfilled it—viz., in what He did in our stead and upon our account; for is it not marvellous that He not only fulfilled it Himself, but that He graciously bestowed upon us that we should fulfil it, which Paul thus manifestly declares—‘For Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to every one who believes;’ and he further says that ‘He condemned sin in the flesh, that the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh, but after the spirit.’ For since the law had for its object to make men righteous, but was enfeebled or weakened, He, by His coming and bringing in the righteousness which is of faith, established the purpose of the law; and what it availed not to accomplish by the letter He accomplished by faith; and therefore He said, ‘I am not come to destroy the law.’ But if any one inquire diligently, he shall find another and a third way in which this has been done. What is that? By means of the precepts which He gave; for there was no abrogation of the former commandments, but an enlargement and fulfilment of them; for the commandment, ‘Thou shalt not kill,’ is not abrogated by the commandment against anger, but it is fulfilled and strengthened by it, and the same of all the others.”

The authority which Mr Smith ascribes to the Old Testament Scriptures is exceedingly limited, and does not rest upon their having a divine revelation of the holy mind and will of God binding upon the faith and obedience of men, but rests solely upon this one ground, and to this one

effect, that they are sufficient to establish any clear and undeniable spiritual truth, and any moral duty, "seeing," he adds, "that moral duty carries its reason in itself, and is therefore binding whenever and wherever, and by whomsoever received." It is difficult to understand how any clear and undeniable spiritual truth requires to be established; for if it be clear and undeniable, to go about to establish it must be superfluous; and if this be the use of the Old Testament Scriptures, they are indeed superseded, not by the New Testament Scriptures merely, but by the dictates of natural religion, and the common-sense of mankind. To propound that they are also of sufficient authority for establishing any moral duty, and this because moral duty carries its reason in itself, is in effect to ascribe to them no higher function or use than belongs to the writings of any respectable human author; nay, the same thing may be affirmed of the Apocryphal writings, and, in point of fact, it has been affirmed by the canons of the Episcopal Church. But previous to leaving this part of the subject, it is important to remark that the same limitation which Mr Smith imposes upon the authority of the Old Testament Scriptures generally—viz., that it is merely didactic authority, and not nomothetic or divinely obligatory on faith and practice—he has expressly and particularly affirmed concerning the authority of the Decalogue. Thus, he says, "The Ten Commandments contain a weighty summary of moral duty, and in so far are perpetually binding." Moral duty, he affirms, carries its reason in itself, and is therefore binding, "whenever, and wherever, and by whomsoever received." Does it not follow from this that he rests the authority of the Ten Commandments essentially and solely upon their accordance with the dictates of man's moral judgment, and not upon the divine will of the Supreme Lawgiver. When Mr Smith, at a subsequent stage of the proceedings, gave a statement of his views to the Presbytery, whilst he professed to re-affirm his replies given at the meeting in October, of which that commented upon was one, he essentially modified it, by leaving out the words "in so far:"—

"But if I understand that substantially, though not formally, he would have me to re-affirm my replies given at the meeting in October, I can most frankly do so, which I now do to this effect: That I hold most firmly the immutability of all divine moral law; and that the Decalogue contains a divinely authenticated summary of that law, which is everlastingly binding, only that the New Testament contains a fuller and clearer statement of the law."

Now, although this is a more guarded statement than the previous, and as such was seized upon by one of the dissentients, and made one of the grounds for a motion to the effect that it amounts to a repudiation or disavowal of the opinions contained in the sermons, it requires to be observed that it concedes nothing in the way of repudiation or disavowal. Mr Smith does not, indeed, now say that the authority of the Decalogue rests upon its being merely a summary of moral duty; but neither does he say that its authority rests unrepealed and unabrogated upon the divine ordination and will of Him whose throne is for ever and ever, and the sceptre of whose kingdom is a sceptre of righteousness. Even the latter and less objectionable statement is entirely compatible with his continuing to hold and teach, "The moral law, as known to the Jews, was perfect so far, being free from mistake; but the perfect law

of God is only uttered in the New Testament, and illustrated in the life of Jesus." "The Christian conscience possesses the advantage of a higher law than they (the Jews) knew." And—"Look back on the sad pages of Christian story—sad, in spite of many a noble heroism and holy service—and as you read the tale of cruel persecutions, and absurd pretensions, and meddlesome interferences, and grasping claims, let me tell you, you will lose all the lessons of wisdom to be gathered from such facts if you ascribe them to any peculiar wickedness in those by whom they were done, for they were often good, and loving, and pious, and true men; but they were men who tried to work out both the Old Testament and the New, and the consequence was, that they turned the gospel of Christ into oppression, and cruelty, and wrong. Hence it is that I am so anxious to impress it on you that the law and the prophets are alike fulfilled and annulled in Christ; for I am quite certain that in any attempt to combine them, if the law will gain something, the gospel will suffer more—Moses may be enlarged, but Christ will far more be restrained."

The proceedings of the Presbytery at the meeting where Mr Smith's answers were received, are given in the papers before the Assembly, and it will be seen that, after two motions had been made and withdrawn—(and here I would observe that they were not made at night, but in the forenoon)—a third motion was adopted unanimously, viz., "That the answers were unsatisfactory." We now come to the last step in the proceedings, and that which gave rise to the dissent which was brought before the Synod of Glasgow and Ayr, referred by that court to the General Assembly. It was moved and unanimously agreed to, that a "Committee be appointed to take into consideration the position in which the whole of this subject is now placed, and to recommend to the Presbytery at an early day what measures, in their judgment, appear to be called for in this case." It will be recollected that the Presbytery, at their meeting on the 12th day of September, unanimously agreed to the following deliverance:—"That the two discourses of Mr Smith be disapproved and censured, as containing statements regarding the moral law of the Old Testament Scripture which are at variance with the language of the Confession and the teaching of Scripture." Now, the committee, proceeding upon this deliverance, suggested to the Presbytery that they should lay before Mr Smith, more categorically and in detail, the objectionable nature of the doctrine in his two sermons, as under the two heads of "1. The Moral Law; 2. The Old Testament Scriptures." And it will be observed that, in furtherance of this suggestion, the committee did further agree to recommend to the Presbytery to call Mr Smith's special attention to certain full extracts from his sermons, such as they deemed to be objectionable, and also to the extracts from the teaching of the Confession of Faith and of the Holy Scriptures appended to these several extracts. And here I may remark that there has been an attempt to-day to represent our position as if we had placed Mr Smith upon trial. That was by no means the position in which he stood towards us. We did not meet with him as a party at all. We looked at and dealt with him as a brother. Our great object was, by private conference, to bring him to judge as we did of his sermons, and to adopt the contrary views which it is said by the dissentients he has adopted. We, however, question that. We have no

ground for adopting that view ; yet they say he has done that. The whole of our proceedings were, therefore, those of a committee of Christian men and of brethren, with a view to bring Mr Smith to what we considered a right way of thinking upon essential facts of divine truth, so that not only the Presbytery, but the whole community, might have the fullest confidence, not only in his talents and eloquence, but in the scriptural care and fidelity and truth of his discourses in future. All that we did was with a view to his spiritual good ; and, therefore, it is entirely to misrepresent the mind and feeling of the Presbytery to consider us as endeavouring to entangle him in any views but those which he was led to embrace after conference and by study of the Word of God, and prayer, as the views of Scripture. Now, before proceeding further, it is necessary to defend the report of the committee from an allegation which was openly made in the Presbytery, and which is more covertly and indirectly alluded to in the reasons of the dissentients—viz., That it goes beyond the original findings of the Presbytery, and raises other issues. To this we reply that it does no such thing, but in express terms reduplicates upon the previous findings of the Presbytery ; for it purports to extract passages which confirm these :—1. Thus, Mr Smith's sermons contain statements regarding the moral law at variance with the Confessions and Scriptures ; and, 2. Passages which contain statements regarding the Old Testament Scriptures of a singular nature, and which prove that the same principles as to superseding, annulling, and abrogating are to be applied to *them wholly*, as had been applied to the moral law of the Old Testament. I should here remark, further, that those members of the committee who have appended their names to the Reasons of Dissent, made no objection whatever of the nature now complained of in the committee, or considered that any irregular step whatever was taken, but cordially co-operated in preparing the report, and approved of the extracts, and the pages annexed to them severally from the Scriptures and the Confession of Faith. Having thus shown that the first reason of dissent is entirely groundless, I now proceed to consider the second reason :—“ II. Because the erroneous opinions which, in the judgment of the Presbytery, the sermons were fitted to teach, have been explicitly disavowed, and the opposite truths confessed in language that is in entire harmony with the standards of the Church.” After the elaborate review which we have taken of the whole proceedings in the case, it is humbly submitted that the dissentients had no valid ground whatever for making this declaration. What was the finding of the Presbytery after hearing Mr Smith's third statement—a statement, be it remembered, in which the dissentients acquiesced ? It was in these brief but decided terms :—“ That the answers were unsatisfactory.” Now, be it observed, that Mr Smith had made no subsequent statement whatever in the Presbytery, of one description or another, from that third statement, until after the motion was made in the Presbytery, which the dissentients supported, and which they now defend by this second reason. When and where were his erroneous opinions in the sermons disavowed, and the opposite truths confessed ? Let them specify, if they can, the time and place. That it was not in the Presbytery can be proved in the most conclusive manner. But this is not the only groundless statement of which there is cause to complain. What does the motion, which the dissentients supported, and now ask

this Assembly to confirm, aver in its second clause? It runs in the following terms:—"2. That the attention of Mr Smith having been specially called, in terms of the report, to those passages in the sermons on which the foregoing sentence is based, and now understanding that he disclaims and rejects the views which the Presbytery considers the passages to convey, and that he adheres to those doctrines of Scripture and the Confession of Faith with which the Presbytery have found the passages in question to be at variance, the Presbytery deem it unnecessary to take any further action in the case." Whatever grounds the mover and supporters of this motion had for understanding what is here affirmed, they were grounds never heard by the Presbytery from Mr Smith. The grounds must have been recent—"now understanding." This motion was made on 19th November. The last statement of Mr Smith, which was declared to be unsatisfactory, was made on the 3d day of October, or more than six weeks prior to the motion. The Presbytery records show that there neither was, nor could be any opportunity for Mr Smith to make any statement to the Presbytery whatever. Whence, then, did this understanding come? Looked at in the light of a matter predicated, the statement in the motion speaks of a fact which had not taken place when the predication was made. And looked at in the light of a matter assumed and expected to be confirmed by Mr Smith—in other words, as an anticipated result—the prediction was entirely defeated by Mr Smith's reply. Instead of disclaiming and rejecting the views complained of by the Presbytery as at variance with the Scriptures and the Confession, what does Mr Smith say?—

"Moderator, it is not easy for me, without more time to weigh the matter, to say whether I can accept Dr Buchanan's motion or not. It may mean much or little, according to the point of view from which it is looked at. If I view it in the light of his speech, it may imply a great deal, which would require me to explain at some length ere I could give any reply whatever. Again, if I view it in the light of the report now given in, then, too, it would mean a great deal; but I should be able at once to decline adherence to it. But if I understand that substantially, though not formally, he would have me to re-affirm my replies given at the meeting in October, I can most frankly do so, which I now do to this effect:—1. That I hold most firmly the immutability of all divine moral law, and that the Decalogue contains a divinely authenticated summary of that law, which is everlastingly binding; only that the New Testament contains a fuller and clearer statement of that law. 2. That the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments are the Word of God, and the only rule of faith and manners; and further, that their organic relation is of such a nature that the Old Testament does not derive its authority from the New, but both have the same kind of authority, and that both taken together are the complete revelation of the Divine will. I therefore, of course, now, as always, unhesitatingly disclaim any opinion at variance with these truths, which has been ascribed to me as supposed to be taught in my sermons."

We have already shown that the first portion of this statement differs from the reply to which he refers as given on 3d October. There he says:—"To sum up my reply to this part of the question as distinctly as I am able, I hold that all moral principle is unchangeably binding, and that the Decalogue, so far as it is moral, partakes of that unchange-

able character." There is no recognition given in his final statement of the intrinsic perfection of the Decalogue; or to employ the language of the Confession of Faith (chap. 19, sec. 2)—"This law after his fall continued to be a perfect rule of righteousness." There is no resiling from the statements in the sermon—"They confound the moral law and the Decalogue as if these were identical. Now the Decalogue was the moral law as revealed to ancient Israel, and a very blessed boon it was—perfect as far as it went, for there was neither error nor flaw in it. But though perfect in itself, as being without mistake, it certainly was not the perfect law. That was reserved for Jesus to reveal." I shall now conclude by offering some remarks on the third reason of the dissentients—"III. Because, after this distinct repudiation of said errors, to exact any formal retraction of the statements of the sermons seems to the complainers at once unnecessary, unreasonable, and harsh." Instead of repudiating the statements of the sermons, the only thing he has repudiated is the judgment which the Presbytery, and, amongst the rest, the dissentients, have pronounced regarding them. The only repudiation we find Mr Smith to make is where he says, "If I view it (the motion embodying the assumption that he disclaimed and rejected the views which the Presbytery held to be unscriptural and censurable) in the light of the report now given in, then, too, it would mean a great deal, but I should be able at once to decline adherence to it." That report does nothing more but adduce passages from Scripture and the Confession of Faith in refutation of the erroneous teaching of the sermons; and by declaring that he does not adhere to the report, he must be understood as declaring that he holds by the statements in the sermons, notwithstanding the light, which the committee endeavoured to throw upon them as being at variance with the Word of God and the Standards of the Church. We challenge the dissentients to show a single instance in which Mr Smith repudiates his errors, and until they make this good, their third reason must be held to be groundless and nugatory. It is said by the dissentients that to enact any formal retraction of the statements of the sermons seems to the complainers at once unnecessary, unreasonable, and harsh. Our friend Professor Douglas, in his remarks to-day, stated that we were requiring something that could not be defended—that the Presbytery asked Mr Smith to retract after he had already stated once and again that he did not consider his views taught in the sermons as being contrary to the Confession of Faith. Professor Douglas said it would be calling upon Mr Smith in these circumstances to say that he was not an honest man, to ask him to retract what was in these sermons. I ask these gentlemen, Why did they form a part of the committee appointed by the Presbytery to deal with Mr Smith if such was their view? The object of that committee was to reason with Mr Smith—to ply him with our views on these matters, with a view to convince him where he was wrong; and I ask if there is anything, after you take that mode of dealing with him, to make it dishonest for a man to say, I was in error, and I retract the error when I declared what I now see to be the opposite of truth? I say this is what makes an honest man, when he finds himself in the circumstances of having errors imputed to him which at first he did not see, but which he has been brought to see are such, after advising and taking counsel with others. (Applause.) I therefore consider that the imputation of doing something—as has been stated from

the bar—which is unreasonable and harsh, ought to fall to the ground, and ought to have no weight whatever with any individual in this Assembly. We are not yet, perhaps, done—at all events, I hope not—with friendly dealings with Mr Smith. I believe that Mr Smith has always maintained very fraternal intercourse with every member of the Presbytery, and that all of us ever rejoice to hear of the prosperity of his congregation. I hope, therefore, that these friendly dealings are not finally closed; and I think the bringing the matter before the Assembly, and the hearing of such a deliverance as the merits deserve, will fortify the Presbytery or the committee in their dealings with their brother. It will come upon him with greater solemnity and force if we can urge upon him this consideration, that the Assembly has declared that he ought to be guided by the views of these essential truths which the Presbytery has endeavoured to set before him. But I will not further encroach upon your time. I have only, in conclusion, to say, that I trust the Assembly, after due consideration of these points which I have endeavoured, however inadequately, to bring under your attention, will be guided to a conclusion which shall accord with that of the Presbytery of Glasgow, and that it will be found not only, what, indeed, all in that Presbytery have already found, that these discourses contain opinions which are contrary to the Confession of Faith and to the Word of God, but that in the circumstances in which Mr Smith may be placed by that judgment, he may see it to be his duty to recognise that position, and to review again the grounds upon which his principles are based, and may, in this way, be led by the blessing of God to see the truth as set forth in the Standards; and so as to enable us to certify that we have the fullest confidence, not only in his ability, but as the beloved pastor of a Free Church congregation of Glasgow, and as a faithful preacher of the truths of the gospel in a great city, where, as in all great cities, most diverse principles on these important questions unhappily exist, and where there are many who are ready to hail the declaration that the Decalogue and the law of God have been abrogated and annulled—that they may act upon the opinion that they can take as much of it as they think the New Testament sanctions, but may set aside other parts which they consider to be without authority, and unsuitable to their case. (Applause.)

Dr GIBSON said—I rise to address the Assembly in circumstances of very considerable difficulty, arising from the nature of the case and the complications which it has undergone in the course of our various proceedings, and also from the difficulty of addressing the House after having already sat so long. I do not wish to insinuate—very much the reverse—that my friends have made their statements a bit too long, considering the very great importance of the case. Under these disadvantageous circumstances, I still find it my bounden duty to state my views. I shall perhaps best do so by making a brief preliminary statement, bringing out the real position of the case between the Presbytery and the dissentients. Then I shall take the liberty of analysing a little further—for Dr Forbes has already so far ably analysed them—the reasons of dissent and our answers. I believe that if the members of this Assembly had had time and opportunity to know this case as well as the members of the Presbytery, I could peril the whole case on our answers to reasons of dissent without more ado. I do not think the statement

made by Dr Douglas is the least objectionable in the way of feeling, or in the way of dealing with his brethren; but I beg leave to say there is not very much required in the way of reply to it. I would just say of the two speeches, or the united speech, from the bar, that it contrasts very unfavourably with the able speech made by Dr Buchanan on the case, though Dr Buchanan's motion contrasts very strangely with his own speech. (Laughter.) Dr Forbes has dealt with it already, where it was alleged in the Court below that by our asking Mr Smith to retract, we were asking him to declare that he does not believe what he does believe. We never had such a notion; but we think this, that if this applied to the statements in the sermons, then, of course, we cannot ask him to retract them; and if so, the Assembly knows what will be our duty in the case. Dr Douglas has stated, that on the 23d October, the members were exhausted when the Presbytery came to a certain decision. As has been remarked, they were not exhausted when the motion was made. Six written and read speeches were delivered in support of that motion, and only the speech of Dr Forbes, in proposing the report, and a speech made by myself, about one o'clock in the morning, were all that we had the power of delivering; so that if parties were exhausted, they had at least time to read six long speeches—(a laugh)—while the speaking on the other side was as I have stated—my own speech being altogether extempore. Again, it has been said that the third motion was withdrawn without leave of the seconder. That is so trivial as hardly to need reply. The seconder, being present, could have objected if he liked, and it was withdrawn, as the minute expressly adds, on the authority of the Court. Then, all the members of Presbytery had over and over before that declared the doctrinal statements contrary to the Confession of Faith and the Word of God, and all the explanations unsatisfactory, and how they required to gather their wits to find out that again, I confess I am not able to say. The validity of the argument that has been employed by Professor Douglas, then, is not very apparent. Then I would remind this House that it was not simply the Presbytery or a majority of them that felt it their duty to fall back on the sermons. Dr Buchanan states himself expressly in his speech on that occasion that they fell back upon the sermons, and that is exactly what we did. With regard to the expressions that have been used at the bar to-day, we have felt all along in this discussion great difficulty in regard to our seeming to bear more hardly upon Mr Smith than we would wish to do. We were much embarrassed in our argument by the desire to avoid the harshness we are charged with. Neither I nor any one on this side of the Presbytery at least would wish to say anything hard or harsh against Mr Smith. I made several, and have published four speeches, and not one hard word can be found in them. But then, Moderator, we must not forget that Mr Smith is a public teacher, entrusted with the solemn work of the ministry, to declare the words of eternal life, and to expound the law of God; and if people are to be perplexed with one statement and then with another, are not the Presbytery bound to take the matter up, and if they find Mr Smith to be wrong, to call upon him that his statements shall be retracted.

I need not spend time in dilating on the importance of this case to the interests of divine truth, and the character of this Church in this land. I shall not trust myself to make a comparison between it

and any other matter that may come before this Assembly. The question raised by it is, whether this Church is to continue to hold the Old Testament to be, even to any extent, an authoritative rule of faith and manners *per se*, of itself, irrespective of any sanction from any other source; whether even the Ten Commandments *per se*, and in their entirety, be the perfect moral law of God, binding in every one of its precepts *per se*, and without sanction from the New Testament, be the perfect moral law of God, and of immutable obligation; whether the New Testament itself, in so far as its statements of doctrine and rules of life are proved by quotations from the Old Testament, and declared by our Lord and His apostles, on the basis of Old Testament Scripture, to be of divine authority, can or are to be received on such grounds as of divine authority; or whether, merely as statements on the authority of the Old Testament, they are now of no force or authority whatever, in and of themselves, but “annulled,” “abrogated,” “abolished,” without one single exception, as to the books, or their contents, the doctrines, the precepts, or anything else. In relation to the Old Testament, the question is not, be it observed, whether the books were originally inspired—that is not denied—but whether the whole books and all that they contain and enjoin—preceptive, ceremonial, and judicial—having received fulfilment, are removed out of the way. But though acknowledged to have been inspired of God, and true witnesses for certain great ends, but are now in their entirety, for any authoritative rules of faith and life, set aside, and the New Testament the alone, and only, and all-sufficient standard of doctrinal truth and moral duty.

Again, the question involved is not whether the Decalogue contains a summary of moral law, or whether “properly moral law” is of immutable obligation. No human being, understanding the meaning of words, so far as I know, has ever denied that. Neither is the question whether a “properly spiritual truth” expressed in the Old Testament is obligatory, but whether, because a doctrine or a precept revealed in the Old Testament, such as “Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God is one Lord,” and “Remember the Sabbath-day to keep it holy,” is on that simple ground, as the revelation of the will of God, to be received and obeyed; or whether they are now of no force or effect to bind and oblige, as we shall answer at the great day of account, unless re-declared and enjoined in the New Testament. On both these great points—viz., the authority of Old Testament Scripture and the obligation of the Ten Commandments as the perfect moral law of God—the Presbytery of Glasgow has twice over, at least, unanimously declared that Mr Smith, in the two sermons which at present are the sole subject-matter of the Presbytery’s judgment and condemnation, has made statements which are “at variance,” “conflict with,” and are “contrary to” (for all these expressions have been used) the Confession of Faith and the Word of God, and that all Mr Smith’s explanations were unsatisfactory. The case as between the Presbytery and the dissentients is not here to determine the heresy or non-heresy of the statements in these two sermons. If statements in conflict with the Confession of Faith and the Word of God be heresy—and we have no other form of expressing it in our judicial procedure—then I know not the heresy you could otherwise characterise; and our judgments on these points are unanimous. They are not now brought before you as between the parties at your bar. They are settled already.

They are not brought before you by any party, or in any form for your judgment. They are *res hactenus judicatee*. On all this the Presbytery were unanimous in their findings, and no dissent or complaint taken by any party whatever—nothing whatever, even in appearance, had emerged to disturb that state of things for which the motion of Dr Buchanan was made and seconded, and for the rejection of which, and not for the rejection of anything else, the Presbytery is brought to your bar by the dissentients. It is impossible to overthrow these facts. With what fairness Dr Buchanan has attached to his published speech a statement afterwards made by Mr Smith, and thus, whether intended or not, conveying the impression that somehow or other it had something to do with the speech and motion of Dr Buchanan, I shall not say. It had nothing whatever to do with it; and whatever may be its value—and I think it of very little for the purpose intended—it cannot be looked at without the grossest injustice, nay, palpable absurdity, in determining the relative value of the two motions made, seconded, and in a great measure discussed, before it was ever heard or dreamed of by the Presbytery; and which, even now, though it might have had some relevancy in relation to the third motion which was withdrawn by its supporters in favour of Dr Buchanan's amendment, in support of which alone the dissentients appear before you, has none now, and had no connection with the motion rejected by the Presbytery.

The case then is, to my mind, simple and clear, and limited to this—Whether the motion approving of the report recommending the Presbytery to insist on the retraction of statements, unanimously decided to be contrary to the Confession of Faith and the Word of God, ought to be retracted, be the wrong judgment; or whether the motion of Dr Buchanan, agreeing, as he did, in the previous judgments, and in the perfect accuracy of the report, which he aided in drawing up, and differing only from the motion carried, in the single exception that his motion recommends to avoid certain “forms of expression,” not certain heretical statements as he declared them to be, in the sermons, be the right one; and Mr Smith be sent back to teach these doctrines if he see proper, and not even to take this hesitating advice; and with all the pernicious doctrinal consequences asserted by Dr Buchanan, as well as others previously, resulting from such opinions, and plainly enough indicated in his various statements, though not now before you for judgment. This is the simple and obvious state of the case as between the Presbytery and the dissentients. By reversing the Presbytery's judgment you will affirm that Mr Smith and all others may teach the doctrines, if he be only cautious as to his “forms of expression.” All this will appear manifest when I come to analyse the reasons of dissent and the Presbytery's answers. Meantime, I must insist on this as the point to be determined, viz., whether Dr Buchanan's motion was the true and right motion, and the judgment of the Presbytery the wrong one. That can only be determined by what was before the Presbytery when the motions were made. That is the question as between the two motions. Their character could not be altered by what was not then before the Presbytery—by an *ex post facto* paper, most irregularly introduced. If it was known beforehand, either to Dr Buchanan or to his supporters, a deception, or at least unwarrantable concealment, was practised on the Presbytery. If it was not, it could not have determined his motion. And I must remark that it was in my view

most improperly asserted in the minutes after the adjournment, and before those of us who had taken an interest in the first motion—that of Dr Forbes—had entered the Court. It can, therefore, not be taken into consideration, whether of more or less value, as of any account in the matter of the two motions—especially as bearing on that of Dr Buchanan, in support of which alone the dissentients are before the Assembly. To this extent, and *in hoc statu*, it is not a question between Mr Smith and the Presbytery, but between the Presbytery and the dissentients in support of the motion of Dr Buchanan. His speech was a speech in favour of the Presbytery, and against Mr Smith out and out. His motion was in the teeth of it, and all the world has seen it. Mr Smith has not declared in favour of the one motion more than of the other. He declines both, or if he seems (it is hardly even seems) to lean to Dr Buchanan's, it is only on conditions which Dr Buchanan's motion never contemplated, and could not contemplate, as he could know nothing about them as an honourable judge in the case. But though it had been known at the outset, it does not repudiate one of the errors or erroneous statements of the sermons. No, not one. Observe, then, that the only parties here are the Presbytery and the minority. Mr Smith is no party here. It has been attempted to show that, as he has never dissented nor complained against any sentence of the Presbytery, he has therefore acquiesced—a very easy way for parties so accused, viz., to say nothing, and let others do the work. But can it be true in regard to former judgments? Certainly not. If it were, it might be true in regard to the judgment dissented against. Is it so? He has never said so. If he has assented and retracted, as is alleged, will any human being assert that it is not the easiest thing in the world to say so? If it be humiliation to say so, is not the self-humiliation—yea, sincere grief and sorrow—the very spirit demanded, and absolutely necessary to the ends of Christian discipline, whether in matters of false doctrine or of immoral conduct? That is the whole end and object of the discipline, if it is to be of any effect either to vindicate the faith and purity of the Church, or to promote the spiritual wellbeing of the subjects of it.

Observe, Sir, there is no debate between the Presbytery and the dissentients as to the facts of the case—no debate as to the subject-matter before us—no debate as to the heterodox nature of the statements in the sermons objected against. The minority declare against them, and save their orthodoxy, but at the expense of their consistency, and, I take leave to say, in my view, of their faithfulness, in so very grave a case. These are the circumstances in which the dissentients have dragged the Presbytery of Glasgow before the bar of the Synod, and now of the Assembly; and in these circumstance, I venture to say it would be something like—to use a favourite expression of the mover of the amendment—an “outrage” to reverse the judgment of the Presbytery of Glasgow, and thus virtually censure them for declaring that doctrines contrary to the Holy Scriptures and the Confession of Faith ought to be retracted. Until it be done, I cannot believe that such shall be the issue in this case. It appears to me that the common sense of all who hold the denial of the doctrine of the Confession of Faith and the Word of God to be heresy must revolt against it. Sir, the dissentients say that such a judgment is unnecessary and harsh. Have they no regard nor compassion for poor souls to whom a pastor is to be sent back, charged with, and declared by

the dissentients themselves to be, teaching doctrines contrary to Holy Scripture and the Confession of Faith, without obtaining from him one single expression of regret or contrition, or one single intimation that he retracts, and will not again preach the same doctrines? Is so serious a matter as that to be decided on inferences founded on laboured and nice distinctions, and most doubtful suppositions, and not on a single statement as matter of fact. Sir, instead of being harsh and unnecessary, the finding of the Presbytery, after repeated judgments such as have been unanimously given, is rather chargeable with useless delay and ill-requited tenderness. The motion long before, except for a tenderness not shown by this Presbytery, in less aggravated cases, might have been to order the framing of a libel; and if there ever was in any case just ground for a libel, it is in a case where so large a Presbytery has unanimously declared over and over again certain things to be contrary to the Confession of Faith and the Word of God, and all explanations unsatisfactory in matters so deeply affecting the rule of faith and the law of life.

I must now crave the indulgence of the Assembly, while I call attention, as briefly as I can consistently with doing justice to this important case, to the reasons of dissent and the answers of the Presbytery. They are to be found at p. 137—printed case. They are pretty long, but they have this advantage, that they save the necessity of very elaborate pleading. But it is my duty not to take it for granted that all the members have carefully studied them, and therefore expound them to a certain extent. Dr Gibson went on to say that the present position of the case was this—that the doctrine of the sermons on the moral law is, in the deliberate judgment of the Presbytery, inconsistent with, and opposed to, the teaching of Scripture and the Confession of Faith of this Church. The report of the Presbytery consisted mainly of extracts from the sermons, and therefore could not be objected to by the dissentients; and he might add, without offence, that Dr Buchanan, having aided in drawing up the report, could not find fault with its contents. Dr Gibson proceeded to examine the reasons of dissent, quoting from the statement made by Mr Smith before the Presbytery. In answer to the first reason of the dissentients, Dr Gibson said, that it is not admitted that the points embraced in the earlier reports of the committee of the Presbytery, “cover the whole ground of doctrine involved in this case.” There are other statements of a most serious nature involving great doctrines of Scripture and the interests of religion and morality, nay, the character of the Divine being Himself. As, for instance, the following passage in his first statement, p. 11:—“Hence, also, the conclusion I have drawn, that, even in regard to those moral duties which are common to both dispensations, the form in which they are binding on us must be sought in the New Testament; for to obey them simply as the Jews did, would be in reality to break them; to obey the first commandment as they did, would be to rise no higher than Socinianism; to obey the seventh commandment as they did, would be to justify polygamy; to obey the fourth commandment as they did, would be to neglect the memorial of Christ’s resurrection. So have I taught my people to think, striving to maintain the fulness that is in Christ. I do not think that such teaching is opposed to the *Confession of Faith*. I am sure it is agreeable to Scripture. But if you think otherwise, you have but to say so. I will bow to your

decision; for I am not one to force my company on those who are unwilling to receive it."

To this I answered in the court below to the following effect:—

In the first place, the question here is not as to what the Jews did, but as to what their Scriptures taught, and which, if they obeyed them, they must do. If that is not the meaning, the statement is utterly irrelevant to Mr Smith's purpose.

In the second place, the word "Socinianism," I presume, is used for Deism; but in both senses the statement here is untrue. The doctrine of Three Persons in the Godhead, or a plurality of persons in the Godhead, as Father, Son, and Spirit, is clearly taught in the Old Testament; and the highest proofs of it in the New Testament are drawn from the Old. Witness the first chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews. Witness our Lord's own argument to the Jews, Matt. xxii. 41: "What think ye of Christ? whose Son is he? They say unto him, The Son of David. He saith unto them, How then doth David in spirit call him Lord, saying, The Lord (Jehovah) said unto my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool? If David then call him Lord, how is He his Son? And no man was able to answer him a word." In the psalms and prophets, too, you have the great doctrine of the Holy Spirit in many passages.

Besides, in revealing the law from Mount Sinai, God made Himself known as a covenant and a Redeeming God, as well as Jehovah. And, moreover, the Redeeming God that thus spoke, was the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob; and Christ therefore said, "Before Abraham was, I AM;" and "Abraham saw his day afar off, and was glad." It was this Jehovah Elohim that created the world, and said, "Let us make man in our image." The Jews knew, or might perfectly have known, more than Deism or Socinianism, whether as relating to the divinity of Christ or to His atonement. Polygamy was neither taught nor sanctioned, but forbidden and condemned, in the Old Testament, as the following facts, every one of which I have proved beyond the power of reasonable question, and no one has attempted the disproof, though before the world for fourteen years—viz., 1, that by the original law, as our Lord himself tells us, it was forbidden. It was the law, therefore, at least, up to the time of Moses, as it is to us since the time of our Lord. Whoever practised polygamy, violated their own law, and the crimes and miseries resulting from it, in the very few instances in which they did violate it, were no sanction but a rebuke. Any instances which occurred during the time of the Mosaic dispensation, one in a hundred years, were no more a sanction than the case of David and Uriah were sanctions of adultery and murder, or than the providential permission, without immediate punishment, of the sins of too many good men, which, if they were recorded by the pen of inspiration, would be hideous enough, were a sanction of their iniquities. It is demonstrable, and has been demonstrated by the use of the language in Lev. xviii. 18, in thirty-four instances out of thirty-five, that the marginal reading "one to another," is the true one, and is a prohibition of polygamy. I cannot argue the case at length. But whatever the Jews did in this respect, they violated their own law, and were not held innocent. Both polygamy and putting away of wives are condemned in Malachi, though God "suffered" it, on account of the hard-heartedness of a ferocious husband with whom a wife could not live,

but which husband was compelled, in such a case, to make some provision for her.

In relation to the last point, Mr Smith cannot be contradicted. You could not have a memorial of what had not taken place, though Paul proves the doctrine of a resurrection, as our Lord did before him, from the Old Testament, (Matt. xxii. ; Acts xiii.) But though the Presbytery has reserved any judgment on these and similar dangerous statements of Mr Smith, we have said in our answers that it is not necessary either to affirm or deny the assertion, that the two points in regard to the moral law and the ancient Scriptures "cover the whole ground of the doctrine in the case," as it is altogether irrelevant, as neither the Presbytery, nor the report of which it has approved, has affirmed the contrary.

Dr Gibson then showed, by referring to pp. 90 and 124 of the record, that the Presbytery strictly confined themselves in their judgment to the statements in the two sermons, which the Presbytery had repeatedly and unanimously condemned as contrary to the Confession of Faith and the sacred Scriptures, and then said the report was held up to ridicule because it contained fourteen extracts from the sermons, as if a judge were to hold a proof back because it was supported by fourteen unexceptionable witnesses ; but the case was simply this—that these extracts had been unanimously condemned by the Presbytery, and they had neither been disavowed nor retracted. Where, then, was there room for a different course—for such a motion as that proposed on the part of the dissentients ? The Presbytery declared the whole of Mr Smith's explanatory statements to be unsatisfactory as to the immutability of a divine moral law. There never was any difference on that subject except in the statements in the newspapers ; and he had to remark that Mr Smith's statements were given at length in all the newspapers, although the same newspapers, with one single exception—though a copy was handed to them as he knew for certain—refused to put in the extracts from the Presbytery's committee. And more ; he believed it was from these statements that a cry had been raised against the Presbytery throughout the length and breadth of the land. The public have never seen the extracts, much less the sermons themselves ; they were never before the Synod nor any party but the Presbytery. They were never published to the world till published in the papers of this House.

Dr Gibson here read the second reason of the dissentients, and the Presbytery's reply as found at p. 139 of the record, and expressed his astonishment at the assertion, that Mr Smith had explicitly disavowed his erroneous opinions, and assented to the opposite truths. He asked when and where ? If it refer to the Confession of Faith, he (Mr Smith) has never yet assented to chap. i. sec. i., ii. of the Confession of Faith, though his attention has been repeatedly called to it. The dissentients have never yet told, how, when and where, he has admitted that the ten commandments are the perfect, exact, and perpetual rule of life. He expressly in many passages denies it. He has never admitted in any one of his explanations, "That this law (of the ten commandments) continues to be a perfect rule of righteousness, and as such was delivered by God from Mount Sinai." He expressly declares the reverse. The Presbytery say in their answer, (p. 139,) "It is true that the motion rejected

by the Presbytery makes the following groundless assertion, viz. :— ‘Understanding that he (Mr Smith) disclaims and rejects the views which the Presbytery considers these passages to convey, and that he adheres to those doctrines of Scripture and the Confession of Faith with which the Presbytery have found the passages in question to be at variance.’” This is indeed a very bold statement, I had almost used a stronger expression. A man may “understand” anything he pleases, but for this assertion there is not a particle of proof; but clear proof to the contrary. The Presbytery therefore say: But to this it is emphatically answered that there was no foundation for such an averment when said motion was first proposed to the Presbytery, which had repeatedly and unanimously affirmed the reverse. Even after the motion was proposed and tabled, the statement *thereafter* given in by Mr Smith, after the adjournment of the Presbytery till the evening sederunt, and then engrossed in the minutes of Presbytery, instead of homologating the averment, expressly declines to accept it in the following terms :—“It is not easy for me, without more time to weigh the matter, to say whether I can altogether accept Dr Buchanan’s motion or not. It may mean much or little, according to the point of view from which it is looked at. If I view it in the light of his speech, it may imply a great deal, which would require me to explain myself at some length ere I could give any reply whatever. Again, if I view it in the light of the report now on your table, then, too, it would mean a great deal; but I should be able at once to decline adherence to it.”

Here Mr Smith most distinctly declines to adhere to the view of Dr Buchanan, who concurred in the whole report, with the exception of the concluding finding, as appeared from the minutes of the committee, read in the Presbytery. Where then is the disclaimer? The “light of Dr Buchanan’s speech” is the very same “light” as my own, delivered months before, only his has a deeper tinge of severity.

Further, referring to the explanatory statements of Mr Smith, which were declared by the Presbytery to be “unsatisfactory,” Mr Smith adds —“But if I understand that substantially, though not formally, Dr Buchanan would have me to re-affirm my replies given at the meeting in October, I can most frankly do so, and I now do so to this effect, namely —1st, That I hold most firmly the immutability of all Divine moral law, and that the Decalogue contains a divinely-appointed summary of that law, which is everlastingly binding; only that the New Testament contains a fuller and clearer statement of the same law. 2d, That the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments are the Word of God, and the only rule of faith and manners; and, further, that their organic relation is of such a nature that the Old Testament does not derive its authority from the New, but both have the same kind of authority, and that both taken together are the complete revelation of the Divine will. I, therefore, now, as always, unhesitatingly disclaim any opinion at variance with those truths which has been ascribed to me, as supposed to be taught in my sermons.”

It will be observed here that Mr Smith only repeats what the Presbytery in October unanimously declared to be unsatisfactory. Observe, further, that he asserts what is not true, obviously and without any doubt, as to the fourth commandment, that the New Testament contains a fuller statement of that law. It is not declared as a LAW in the New Testa-

ment at all, and Mr Smith has never admitted the fourth commandment to be binding. He denies thus the doctrine of the perpetual moral obligation, not only of the ten commandments generally, but of the fourth commandment in particular, as asserted in the Confession of Faith, chap. xxi. This declaration of holding the "immutability of all Divine moral law"—no human being having a mind and conscience ever did deny or could deny that. But where is it to be found? Where are the mass of human beings to find it if not in the ten commandments? He uses the phrases "properly moral law," and any "undeniable spiritual truth," but he refuses to admit that the Decalogue decides what is the one—or that the authority of the Old Testament affirming it decides the other. Mr Smith is most careful to exclude the idea that the Decalogue *is* the moral law. The question is not as to what is duty under a remedial dispensation. But what is and was the moral law, the violation of which made a remedial dispensation necessary? It was the law given to Adam, the law of nature, the moral law of the ten commandments. It was of this law it was said, "Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things written in the book of the law to do them." It was of this law that the Apostle to the Galatians, after quoting these words, adds, "Christ has redeemed us from the curse of the law by being made a curse for us." Where then is the redemption of Christ if He did not bear the curse of the "perfect moral law"? which perfection Mr Smith expressly denies to the Decalogue. Mr Smith has given no statement of the continued authority of the Old Testament *per se*. He is most careful to hold that any authority which it has, is only conjointly with, and so far as it has been re-enacted in the New Testament. See pp. 9, 10, 85, 86 of the Record.

It is demonstrated in the answers of the Presbytery that he holds the law—of course, not abstract, immutable moral law—is "annulled;" he could not so befool himself, but the moral law of the ten commandments, except in so far as, he says, "it was reserved for Jesus Christ to reveal," (see Record, p. 141,) contrary to the express statements of the Confession of Faith already referred to, and never once admitted by Mr Smith.

With regard to Mr Smith's explanation, that he disclaims now as "always" certain things, but he has given the dissentients no new ground for doing what they now proposed to do, contrary to their former judgments.

Dr Gibson was going on in illustration, amid some symptoms of impatience on the part of the audience, which drew from him the remark, "I am aware that some parties may be tired."

A VOICE—"We are all tired."

Dr GIBSON—I assure you I am as tired of it as anybody. (Laughter.) The effect and nature of such teaching I may be permitted to illustrate by an extract which I will now read. Without homologating the idea of the law being revealed by the First Person of the Godhead, I may quote the following:—"We must pause with awe to remember what was the principal office to be fulfilled by the advent. When the ineffable mystery of the incarnation was consummated, a Divine Person moved on the face of the earth in the shape of a Child of Israel, not to teach but to expiate. True it is that no word could fall from such lips, whether in the form of profound parable, or witty retort, or perceptive.

lore, but to guide and enlighten ; but they who, in those somewhat lax effusions, which in those days are honoured with the holy name of theology, speak of the morality of the gospel as a thing apart and of novel revelation, would do well to remember that in promulgating such doctrines they are treading on very perilous ground. There cannot be two moralities ; and to hold that the Second Person in the Holy Trinity could teach a different morality from that which had been already revealed by the First Person of the Holy Trinity, is a dogma so full of terror that it may perhaps be looked upon as the ineffable sin against the Holy Spirit. When the lawyer tempted our Lord, and inquired how he was to inherit eternal life, the great Master of Galilee referred him to the writings of Moses. There he would find recorded "the whole duty of man ; to love God with all his heart, and soul, and strength, and mind, and his neighbour as himself. These two principles are embalmed in the writings of Moses, and are the essence of Christian morals." The House will be a little surprised, I daresay, when I announce that this extract is taken from "A Political Biography of Lord George Bentinck. By B. Disraeli." (Laughter.) Though, of course, people may laugh at the name, I would tremble to lower our sense of the importance of this matter, or that the Free Church should incur the alarming responsibility of doing anything to produce such an effect, in relation to the law of everlasting life, on the minds of such men. (Hear, hear.) Parties may laugh. I do not quote the passage for the name ; I quote it on account of the noble sentiment and the warning voice raised against giving any judgment that would help to lead such men, or any men, to think lightly of the Ten Commandments as the moral law of God.

Dr CANDLISH spoke to order. He was sorry to interrupt Dr Gibson ; but as the usual hour of adjournment had come, and as they could not reasonably be expected to sit longer at that time, he had to propose that the House adjourn till seven o'clock.

The Assembly accordingly adjourned at 4.35 P.M.

EVENING SEDERUNT.

The Assembly resumed at seven o'clock. Mr Wilson, Dundee, Moderator, *pro tem*,—when the House was even more crowded than in the forenoon.

Dr GIBSON resumed his speech by saying that, if they were to receive the simple disclaimer of the party without themselves deciding on the merits, there never would be a trial at all, in any case, civil, criminal, or ecclesiastical. He held that mere disclaimers were of no value whatever. He was the more anxious to dwell upon this point, because it had been made the ground for asserting that Mr Smith disclaimed the opinions that were believed to be enunciated in the sermons ; and it will yet be pleaded at the bar, as it is the only ground of Dr Buchanan's motion ; but he believed that Mr Smith had never yet disclaimed one single sentence or one single statement which the Presbytery had repeatedly pronounced to be contrary to the Confession of Faith and the Word of God. Dr Gibson here referred to the case of Mr Wright, who was brought before the General Assembly in 1841, charged with heresy. In his answers and defences, Mr Wright frequently declared, in the strongest terms that language could furnish, that he not only held no

heresy, but that he had "not even a shade of thought or of opinion that was at variance with the standards of the Church, and with the most orthodox views of Christianity." He charged the Presbytery with not taking "a comprehensive view of the meaning" of his writings; and in answer to a letter from Dr Bannerman, he said:—"As to the contents of the books, I have no reason to believe that they contain any heresy whatever. They certainly were not intended to contain anything of the kind. For the standards of our Church I have ever entertained a conscientious reverence, and would be as unwilling as any person whatever to utter one word that was inconsistent with them. The pervading spirit of the books was meant to be in harmony with these standards, and there are many passages of them which contain express testimonies of my adherence to these standards. I solemnly disclaim the most remote intention of impugning any doctrine sanctioned by our Church, and I am confident that nothing can be found in the books inconsistent with these doctrines, without palpable misconstruction." Did the Presbytery act on these allegations? No; and he begged the attention of the Assembly to the reply, because, if they substituted the name of "Smith" for "Wright," he thought it would exactly meet the present case. (Laughter.) He found the Presbytery of Dalkeith, in their able report—the convener being Dr Bannerman, then Mr Jas. Bannerman, minister at Ormiston—replying in these terms:—

"Before proceeding to state the grounds of their judgment upon the evidence, the Presbytery desire to offer a brief explanation in regard to one additional point. In his first written statement, laid on the table of the Presbytery, Mr Wright declared his willingness to retract and apologise for any passage in his works which might be pointed out and shown to be erroneous; and the same thing, though less explicitly, was adverted to in some of his subsequent communications. One motive with the Presbytery in so urgently desiring to enter into dealing with Mr Wright on the subject matter of the libel was, undoubtedly, their wish to ascertain in what way that offer of retractation was to be understood, and to what extent, if any, it was to be held as going. What was the value to be attached to a retractation in the circumstances in which Mr Wright was placed, and with the charges that were laid against him; or what was the effect to be given to it at the particular time when made, were questions which the Presbytery deemed themselves fortunate in not being called upon to entertain or forced to answer. After all their attempts to deal with Mr Wright had proved unsuccessful; and when in no other form did they obtain from him anything beyond a general expression of his willingness to retract, while at the same time he never admitted that there was anything needing to be retracted, the Presbytery felt that no cause had arisen to preclude the necessity of going on to the probation of the libel. In point of fact, Mr Wright never has retracted anything; and he has refused, moreover, to adopt the only opportunity available for such a purpose, by refusing all along to be dealt with by the Presbytery on the subject of the errors which needed to be retracted. Indeed, the Presbytery are compelled to say that in some instances, so far from there being manifested a disposition on the part of Mr Wright to admit and retract the offence, there appears, even in these documents given in by him in defence and exculpation, what amounts very nearly, if not altogether, to a repetition of it—a fact which will be adverted to more par-

ticularly afterwards. It is acknowledged, no doubt, by Mr Wright on some occasions that there may be passages in his books which, from various causes the most remote from erroneous doctrine, may be liable to misconstruction, or from their peculiar phraseology and turn of thought may even beget suspicion in minds apt to suspect. But, with regard to direct heresy, more especially the heresy charged in the libel, he uniformly and strongly disavows the interpretation. . . . Upon the whole, the Presbytery feel that they are not called upon to determine what value may attach to the declaration made by Mr Wright of his willingness to retract any passage in his writings which could be pointed out to be erroneous, at the very time that he utterly disavows the errors pointed out and imputed to him in the libel."

When that case came before the Assembly of 1841, Dr P. Macfarlan moved that the libel be held proven. Others took part in the discussion, and he never could forget the talent and skill which were displayed by Dr Candlish, who made a remarkable speech in support of the motion finding the libel proven, and he would not be sorry were he to hear that night an equally remarkable speech in the same strain from the same gentleman. (Laughter and applause.) In the *Scottish Guardian* newspaper of the day, Dr Candlish was reported to have said—"The Assembly had not the slightest evidence before them of a single expression of contrition on the part of Mr Wright, and he held that nothing remained for them but to proceed to the painful duty of pronouncing deposition."* Mr Wright

* The statement made by Dr Candlish in 1841 had not only an important bearing on the case of Mr Smith in a general way, but on one of the heresies charged against Mr Smith in particular. He said "I must take leave to say, that whatever might be the result of this night's discussion—although it should end in a manner painful to the feelings of every member of the House—although it should end in a manner fatal to the ministerial character of our accused brother—viewing, as I do, the doctrines promulgated in these books, as not merely flights of fancy, or extraordinary statements given forth by a man of original mind: but as deadly errors, dishonouring to the Lord Jesus Christ, whose minister he is, and ruinous to souls,—I, for my own part, shall feel deeply solemnised indeed, but shall feel no disposition to regret the part which, at the beginning of this process, it fell to me to take."

Again—"I entreat the House to remember (for I have no right to speak authoritatively) that, most painful as it is to flesh and blood, we are now called into a position in which we owe something to the individual himself at the bar—in which we owe something to the Church of Christ, in which we owe something to the world at large, which his books are tending to ensnare, and in which we owe something to the great and only Head of the Church; and what we owe in all these various ways we cannot render, except in going straight forward to the discharge of our duty, however painful and distressing it may be. . . ."

"Instead of allowing the arm of discipline to slumber now, out of a mere *fancied* tenderness to the individual himself, which is not in accordance with the end of discipline, and is not real tenderness—for in such a case faithfulness is tenderness—how awful if we should seem for a moment to vacillate or waver! Wavering in such a case is dishonouring to Him whose pure doctrines we are called to vindicate, and involves the guilt of letting our trumpet give an uncertain sound.

"In count twelfth, which I notice rather in consequence of a doubt, or something like it expressed by my reverend father, Principal Dewar, Mr Wright is charged with denying the doctrine 'that the Word of God, and the divine law revealed therein, form at all times and in all circumstances the only authoritative, exact, and perfect rule of faith and life.' It cannot escape the observation of the Assembly that this charge was entirely evaded in the speech for the defendant at the bar, by the simple process of omitting the adjectives and taking only the substantive. The adjectives were omitted, and the charge was treated as if he was accused of denying that the Word of God is at all times and in all circumstances the only rule of faith and life; and the libel was met with the assertion that there are other rules besides the Word of God. Doubtless there are other rules. I am not going to deny the authority of the law of conscience or the existence of the light of nature. The charge was misapprehended. It is not a charge of denying that the divine law formed the only rule of faith and life, but of denying that it formed the

was deposed accordingly. He called attention to this case solely for the purpose of showing that it was utterly futile to accept a person's own disclaimer, or his assertion of misunderstanding and misrepresentation as a satisfactory settlement of a matter of this kind. The Assembly could not listen to that argument. The sermons were before them; they were unanimously condemned by the Presbytery, and all they asked was that they should be retracted. He did not wish to introduce anything of a ludicrous character in so grave a case; but they all knew the story of a clergyman similarly situated as Mr Smith, that when the charge was brought against him, he replied—"Moderator, if that be heresy, I retract." (Laughter.) Mr Smith had not gone even that length, and what foundation there was for asserting that he had retracted he could not possibly discover. If he had retracted, or given any appearance of it, he (Dr Gibson) ventured to say that the case would not have been proceeded with so far as it had been.

After adverting to the absurdity of Mr Smith's exegesis, Dr Gibson pointed out, in the words of his speech delivered in the Presbytery, May 22, 1866, the pernicious consequences of Mr Smith's heresy. He said:—What, then, are some of the effects which must result from the opinions of Mr Smith, as maintained in these sermons?

1. Supposing I am right in concluding that he holds that the Old Testament *only authoritative, exact, and perfect* rule. And I crave the House to observe that this charge really applies, not to the Word of God as teaching doctrines, but as *revealing the moral law*. In this count the Bible is not viewed as the standard of faith merely, but as revealing the Divine Law—the eternal law of God—that law which is holy, and just, and good; revealing that law which is identical with the law written on man's heart, yet is revealed fully and authoritatively only in Scripture. The heresy charged against Mr Wright here—and it is one of a very peculiar character—is neither more nor less than the denial of law altogether, in any correct sense of the word *law*—the denial of a moral law altogether, and specially of the moral revealed where alone it is fully revealed—viz., in the word of God. He is charged with denying the existence of a perfect standard as obligatory on man; and what does he substitute for it? A certain fine ideal notion of excellence, which a man may propose to himself as a model; and this he expressly and pointedly contrasts with the doctrine of absolute and unconditional perfection being the object proposed to man, setting aside the imperative obligation of a perfect law, and putting in its place something far short of it in respect of its perfection, and entirely different from it in respect of its obligation. . . . Such is Mr Wright's theory of morals. It is a theory rising to some sublime conceptions, and descending to some useful practical regulations. But it is evidently a denial of the law of God, as revealed in His Word, as the only *authoritative, exact, and perfect* rule of duty. According to Mr Wright, there is no *authoritative* rule, no rule absolutely binding and obligatory, to which conformity is peremptorily required, and the transgression of which involves guilt and liability to punishment. There is no *exact* rule, no rule uniform and invariable: the same for all. Each man forms his own 'ideal'; and even to himself his own 'ideal' is no *exact* rule. It shades off indefinitely into the 'actual' and the 'minute.' Finally, there is no *perfect* rule. The very possibility of there being a *perfect* standard for man on earth is denied and denounced. We hold the law of God, as revealed in His Word, to be an authoritative, exact, and perfect rule; the only rule that is so. Mr Wright holds that there is no such rule at all. The charge against him is substantially this, that he denies to man even a capacity of forming an idea of a perfect standard, and denies that there is any such standard so imposed by God and so binding upon men that they are liable to punishment if they violate it. He substitutes for it an ideal model, just as a painter might study an ideal model before him in order to excite himself to excellence in his art. This is literally the moral theory of Mr Wright, as clearly and distinctly laid down in the passages which are quoted in the libel. This is what he puts in room of that law of the Lord, which is 'perfect, converting the soul,' (Ps. xix. 7.) The ideal of excellence which he sets before me to stimulate me to duty is just as little a law *binding* upon me as a painter's model is binding upon him. This is the fundamental heresy of the book, that upon which the denial of sin and of the atonement proceeds. A sense of guilt is, in any right view of the terms, rendered impossible by this theory; there can be no such thing as Paul refers to in Romans, chap. iii., when, after concluding both Jews and Gentiles under sin, he adds, 'that every mouth may be stopped, and the whole world become guilty before God.'

tament is no authoritative rule to us, it sweeps away the whole doctrine of our Confession of Faith as to the duty and relation of the civil magistrate to the Church of the living God ; and we have neither authoritative law, principle, nor approved example by which we can determine its truth, contrary to Rom. xv. 4, "Whatsoever things were written aforetime, were written for our learning."

2. It sweeps away any authoritative rule or law by which we are to be bound in the observance of the Sabbath. The Fourth Commandment, as such, is abolished.

3. It sweeps away the laws against incest, except in the one case referred to in 1 Cor. v. 1.

Hence it is that in the Voluntary controversy, the authority of the Old Testament, in determining such a question, was by many denied, and the denial reacted mischievously on the Fourth Commandment. Hence also the enemies of the Sabbath not only ignore, but deny the authority of the Fourth Commandment. Hence also, in the question of marriages with the sister of a deceased wife, or of uncle with niece, and so forth, their advocates deny the authority of the Levitical law, and plead that they are not forbidden by the law of God. The consequences of such views I look upon, therefore, as most perilous, not only to the interests of religion, but of public and social morality. Dr Buchanan, in his speech in December thereafter, manifestly adopted these views, and repeated them in different words and with some additions. Dr Gibson proceeded to say, in conclusion, that it was not his business to lecture the Assembly, nor was it wise in parties pleading in a judicial case to adopt that course. He must, however, express his opinion that, should the General Assembly give a decision, the effect of which would be to shelter the views brought out in these sermons, it would carry dismay into the hearts of many of the most godly people in the Free Church. (Applause and slight hisses.) He repeated—for he was not one of those who were deterred by such paltry interruptions—that it would carry dismay into the hearts of the most godly people not only of this Free Church, but of all sound Presbyterians holding by the doctrine of the Confession of Faith. He had now discharged his duty ; and the responsibility would rest with the Assembly if they sheltered the doctrines which had been referred to—doctrines which had not been retracted, which had not called forth an expression of regret from their author, or—to use the phrase of Dr Candlish—even a single word of contrition. (Slight hisses.) He would take leave further to say that he did not think it was a very favourable symptom of the rising youth of this Church that they should hiss such statements as he had been making.

Principal CANDLISH—I rise to order. That is an unworthy remark to come from the bar. It is for the House to judge of this matter, and not for the bar to speak. That was decidedly intimated in the forenoon by Mr Nixon, who wished that the gallery should be cleared, and I intimated my willingness to second the motion. It is not, therefore, for the bar to deal with that matter.

Dr GIBSON—I know the House does not approve of these interruptions ; but, as a party at the bar, I feel myself entitled to point out to the Church the consequences of giving such a judgment. If the Moderator of this Assembly rules me out of order, I will stand rebuked ; but I hold my right, as a member of this House, as well as a party at the bar,

to give free expression to my opinion of the conduct of the audience, and I am not on any individual member's authority. (Hear and applause.) I care not who the man may be, or what his influence; I hold I have a right to be heard at the bar. (Hear, hear.) At all events, you cannot hinder me saying this, that a judgment of this kind will give encouragement to Mr Smith to continue this kind of teaching, and to all others who may choose to follow in his steps. (Hear, and applause.) He entreated the House to pause before putting the Church—to say nothing of the Presbytery—in so very serious a position. (Applause.)

Dr BUCHANAN then replied on behalf of the appellants. He said—Moderator, I am extremely glad the House has heard the other side of the bar at such great length, because it will satisfy them and the House also that they suffered no great wrong in permitting the composite speech of my friend Professor Douglas to be spoken. I would like, before going further, to refer to the somewhat exciting statements with which Dr Gibson closed his address, and to say that if there be any danger of those results, those dangers to religion and the Church, to which he referred, and of which he spoke in language so strong, it is just from the use of that language that these dangers will arise, and it is just because the other side of the bar has so strangely forgotten that in all the sentiments that have been expressed about the true view of the doctrine involved in this case there are not two parties at the bar, and that there will not be two parties in the House. In the Court below I was at some pains to bring out the strong and decided views we take of the erroneous and dangerous character of the views by which the teaching of the sermons appears to us to be pervaded. The statement I made on that occasion has, I believe, been seen by many members of this House—Dr Gibson says, “it has been seen by all the world!”—and I have no intention of repeating any part of it now. On that subject those who occupy the other side of the bar have said, and can say nothing stronger than I have said myself, and would say here again if it were at all necessary, or could serve any useful purpose. There is no member of this House who has a deeper sense than I have of the mischievous and dangerous tone and tendency of Mr Smith's teaching in the sermons which originated this whole case. Dr Gibson indeed has said that the questions to be decided to-day are, whether this Church holds the authority of Old Testament Scriptures, and whether it holds the permanent and binding authority of the Ten Commandments. In condemning the sermons for their teaching on those very points, the whole Presbytery united in answering both these questions most emphatically in the affirmative, and that there are no such questions here for decision in the Assembly I shall presently show. The truth is, that although the case before the Assembly has had a long and somewhat intricate history, the question, and the only question which it brings up here for judgment, is a comparatively simple one. On the merits of the case, properly so called, there is, as you have heard, no difference of opinion whatever between the two sides of the bar. And as regards the view which ought to be taken of the teaching of Mr Smith, in the two sermons on which the whole case is founded, the appellants and the respondents are entirely at one. Attention was most properly called to this deeply important fact by my friends beside me who opened the pleadings, and now that the pleadings are about to close, I am earnestly desirous that it should

be fully before the mind of the House. The censure which the Presbytery of Glasgow twice over pronounced upon the sermons the appellants are here asking the Assembly to reaffirm. So far there is no dispute. So far the Presbytery of Glasgow, by much the largest Presbytery in the Church, are absolutely and entirely of one mind. We were unanimous in pronouncing this judgment, "That the two discourses of Mr Smith be disapproved and censured, as containing statements respecting the moral law and the Old Testament Scriptures which are at variance with the language of the Confession of Faith and the teaching of Scripture." Against that judgment even Mr Smith himself has entered no dissent, and has taken no appeal. It is *res judicata*, and there is no proposal from any quarter to touch it. And, surely, let me here say, Moderator, this is a thing for which to be profoundly thankful, that at a time like the present, when errors of the very kind which appeared to be countenanced by the language of the censured sermons are so widely abroad in certain other churches, and are in the course of being extensively followed out to all their logical and disastrous issues, both in the pulpit and in the press, they should have been met in this Free Church with a condemnation so prompt, so decided, and so unanimous, cannot fail to be regarded by this Assembly, and by the friends of truth everywhere, as presenting a loud call for devout gratitude to God. Let it be clearly understood, then, that it is not at all as to what should be said of the sermons, or decided as to the errors they teach, that the parties at your bar disagree, but solely and only as to what should be done with their author, Mr Smith. Now, in dealing with this totally distinct and different question, let me remind the Assembly that Mr Smith is not here under a libel. The Presbytery of Glasgow have never charged Mr Smith with personally holding, or intending to teach, the erroneous views we have discovered in the two sermons. We have never, to this hour, even put him to the bar. We have simply dealt with him as a brother and member of our Court, who, in consequence of the adverse rumours that were in wide circulation about the teaching of the sermons, felt it to be his duty to ask us to look into them, and to consider whether or not they deserved to be so unfavourably spoken of. For his own sake, for the sake of his congregation, and for the sake of the interests of the Church and of divine truth, he himself laid this duty upon us. It was right and honourable on his part to do so, and the very fact of his doing it bound us carefully to abstain from assuming that he had consciously and purposely taught anything at variance with Scripture and the standards of the Church. On that footing the whole inquiry proceeded up to the point at which my appeal, and that of the friends beside me, was taken. Proceeding on that footing, a committee, as you have already heard, and as the papers in the case show, was at once appointed, and of which Principal Fairbairn was convener. As the result of that committee's many and earnest conferences among its own members and with Mr Smith, statements were made by him once and again to the Presbytery, and reports were, once and again, brought up by the committee. In the course of these dealings, and after both the committee and the Presbytery had come to be of one mind as to the actual teaching of the sermons, steps were taken, in order, if possible, to ascertain the state of Mr Smith's own mind and belief on the points regarding which they had found the language of the sermons to be of a nature to convey erroneous

views. For this purpose two testing-questions were put to him; and, although they have been more than once already adverted to, it concerns my present object to place them distinctly at this stage before the Assembly. The questions were these—"1. Do the Ten Commandments, as given from Sinai, and summed up in the two great precepts—perfect love to God and brotherly love to man—contain a revelation of the law of God binding on Christians, and one that is comprehensive of all moral duty? 2. Are the Scriptures of the Old Testament, with the requisite allowance for what is stated in the Confession as the ceremonial and judicial statutes, still an authority in themselves for the establishment of doctrine and the inculcation of moral duty, irrespective of any fresh sanction or enforcement of them in the New Testament Scripture?" Mr Smith gave answers to these questions; and there is no sort of doubt that, had the answers so given appeared to be satisfactory, the whole question would have terminated there and then. The disapproval and censure of the sermons would of course have been repeated, and some suitable caution and admonition would have been given to Mr Smith to avoid such misleading and dangerous modes of expressing himself in the pulpit in future; but the whole case would undoubtedly have taken end. Now, in point of fact, a large number of members of Presbytery did actually think the answers were satisfactory. I was myself very much disposed to think so; and had it not been that something which Mr Smith, in answer to appeals made to him by various members to be a little more explicit, led me to regard his answers as a little less explicit than till that moment they had appeared to me to be, I would have persisted in moving for a decision to the effect that they were satisfactory in this sense and to this extent, that nothing more needed to be done. It was very late at night. The court had been sitting for twelve hours. Dr Gibson has just told us he had been making his speech at one o'clock in the morning. Every one was exhausted, and not finding myself in a position at that moment to press a motion embodying an assertion over the correctness of which a shade of doubt had been cast—the only other motion before the Presbytery was allowed, in these peculiar circumstances, and in the midst of some confusion, to pass; and the answers accordingly, in terms of that motion, were pronounced to be unsatisfactory. It was from this point that the perfect unity which had hitherto characterised our whole action and judgment in this case came to an end. It was on the 3d of October the proceedings took place to which I have just alluded. The Glasgow Divinity College Session was then at hand, and Dr Fairbairn found it to be quite impossible, with the pressure of official duties which was in consequence awaiting him, to act any longer as convener of the committee. Quite naturally, and most properly, the mover of the motion which had been adopted by the Presbytery was placed in that position, and under these auspices the committee were reappointed, and instructed to report on two specific points—first, as to the position in which the whole question now stood; and, second, as to what measures the Presbytery ought to take in further dealing with it. I do not know exactly how it was, but one way or another we did not succeed in getting on so well as we had done before. Through some quite innocent inadvertence or misunderstanding, some of us were not called to meetings of the committee at which steps were taken in which we could not concur, and even in

making up the report, which those who were present adopted, such confusion somehow arose that, at the last moment, and after the report had been circulated among the members of committee, a whole page of it had to be cancelled, in order to get rid of a rather questionable proposition, to the support of which the committee would otherwise have been rather awkwardly pledged. I allude to these things, in order to explain my own subsequent proceedings, and those of my friends, Principal Fairbairn and Professor Douglas, as having found ourselves constrained to oppose the decision of a committee to which we belonged, and to do so in the Presbytery, without having done it in the committee itself when the decision was adopted. The facts I have mentioned will explain how it happened that we had no opportunity of doing so. In part, indeed, of the committee's recommendation to the Presbytery we quite agreed. We joined with them in recommending to the Presbytery that "the objectionable nature of the doctrine in his two sermons, as under the two heads of (1) The Moral law : (2) The Old Testament Scripture" should be laid "more categorically and in detail" before Mr Smith. We thought it most fitting and most desirable that Mr Smith should in this way have another opportunity afforded him of looking at the language he had employed, in order that he might the more clearly see what it was in the sermons with which we found fault, and in the hope that, more clearly seeing it, he might be led to make some such further statement of his real views on the points in question as would relieve the minds of all his brethren, and render any further procedure on the part of the Presbytery altogether unnecessary. But we did not at all concur in the committee's further recommendation, that the Presbytery should "insist on the indispensable necessity of the retraction and disavowal by Mr Smith of the statements in the foregoing extracts on which the finding is based, and of which a summary is given in the preamble of this report." There were two grounds on which we found it impossible to concur in making such a peremptory demand. We disliked the harshness of it. It had the look at least of driving Mr Smith to the wall. To require any man, and especially a man in his position, to eat in his own words, and that, too, at the point of the bayonet, would in our view have been to subject him to a humiliation both uncalled for and unkind. He is the minister of a large congregation. He possesses gifts of a high order. If he is to continue in the ministry of our Church, and if in the exercise of these gifts, and in the charge of that congregation, he is to be of any use, he must not be subjected to needless degradation. But we objected to their demand on another and quite different ground, and one stronger still. To "insist on the retraction and disavowal by Mr Smith"—not of the *sentiments*, observe, "but of the statements" contained in the extracts specified—was virtually to insist that he should put himself in the position of admitting that these statements did convey a meaning which, from beginning to end of these proceedings, he has been in the attitude of disclaiming. Such a position, with the views he holds, he obviously could not consent to occupy. I would indeed have been very glad—all the appellants would have been very glad—if Mr Smith had come to see his statements in the same light in which we see them, and if in consequence he had, of his own accord, withdrawn them. But even in the case supposed, I could never have concurred in a proposal to insist on his doing so as the indispensable condition on

which he was to be let off. There is something, to my mind, so odious in that way of dealing with a brother in his circumstances, that I could never persuade myself to regard it as either right or wise. Much less, of course, could I persuade myself to approve of putting Mr Smith in the false position of even appearing to admit that he had taught opinions which he himself tells us he never intended to teach and does not hold. What I said to myself was this—if the statements he makes now about the moral law and the Old Testament Scriptures are substantially at one with those which our Church makes on those great subjects, I shall not be much concerned to press him hard about retraction; I shall accept his disclaimer of the erroneous, and his assertion of the true doctrine, as retraction sufficient; and I hope it will be found that this General Assembly are quite prepared to do the same. The question, of course, remains, Has Mr Smith really said anything which amounts to what I have now described? Has he actually given us the kind of satisfaction which the appellants not only think it reasonable to ask, but contend for, as being indispensable in order to a peaceful settlement of this case? It is with that question I now wish to deal, as it humbly appears to me to be the question on which the decision to be pronounced by this Assembly must ultimately turn. Now, in dealing with that question, I do not forget that, on the 3rd of October, the Presbytery of Glasgow, in the very special and peculiar circumstances I have already described, pronounced a judgment to the effect that Mr Smith had not given the satisfaction I have admitted to be necessary. Neither do I forget that although that judgment was much less unanimous than outwardly and technically it seemed to be, it was unopposed at the time and cannot be disturbed now. But the fact that the Presbytery were not satisfied on the 3rd of October is no reason for assuming that they ought not to have been satisfied on the 19th of November. In the course of that interval, an elaborate report had been prepared by the Presbytery's committee, the whole object of which was to let Mr Smith distinctly see what it was in his sermons of which they complained, and on what grounds they complained of it. If, therefore, either on a further and fuller consideration of the statements in explanation made previously by Mr Smith, or on the ground of explanations which it had come to be known that Mr Smith was willing to make when their new report was to be disposed of, it could be made to appear that the satisfaction desired had been actually obtained, it was of course quite open to the Presbytery to come to a corresponding judgment. A judgment of that sort the appellants thought themselves entitled to ask the Presbytery to pronounce. The grounds on which they rested that conviction have been already explained. The Assembly will pardon me, however, if I presume, in the briefest possible manner, to rehearse them. They constitute the whole strength of our case as appellants against the sentence to which the Presbytery came. And first, and in fairness to Mr Smith, let me remind the Assembly that, while, as already stated, the Presbytery's committee unanimously condemned the teaching of the sermons, they frankly admitted all along that he had never acquiesced in the construction the committee put upon his words. They were "to be understood," they said, in their very first report, given in on 10th May 1866, "as speaking of the discourses considered by themselves, and in their broad and general characteristics," &c. They added that Mr Smith, in his explanatory statement, had disclaimed "the general and comprehen-

sive reference that his language seemed to all the members of committee naturally to involve." And they also quoted the declaration which at that early stage of the inquiry Mr Smith made of "his belief in the inspiration of Old Testament Scripture as God's Word," and of the "real authority of the whole Bible." And, still further, the committee noticed the fact, that in what he said in the sermons of the New and the Old Testament Scriptures, he had, in his explanatory paper, distinctly stated, that he "had respect only to the laws and the relations of the two economies, or to the documents only in so far as they bore upon these," and that he disclaimed "having had any further reference," though he admitted "that people might find in the discourses plausible reasons for ascribing to him another meaning." Again, in their second report, given in to the Presbytery on the 12th September, and referring to a second explanatory statement which had meanwhile been made by Mr Smith, the committee took occasion to say—"This vagueness or ambiguity which discovers itself in the very mode of putting the decisive questions, appears to your committee to pervade, to a considerable extent, both statements, but especially the second, and to have arisen from the endeavour to maintain still the form of representation employed in the discourses, and, at the same time, to combine with it the substance of what is held in the doctrine of the Church. There are—the committee go on to say—it is proper to add, various expressions which point in this last direction. Such as—"That truth and duty were one at all times;" that "moral duty consists essentially in love to God and love to man, and that this general principle was laid down in the Old Testament as well as in the New;" that "the entire revelation which God has given is essentially one;" "that one way of salvation by faith runs through all the records of God's will, and especially the law of moral duty pervades all." Of course I quite concur in the conclusion to which the committee, notwithstanding these statements, unanimously came, that they "could see no way of reconciling them with the expressions of a different kind" which the sermons contained; and that the sermons ought to be censured. But I am not speaking at present of the teaching of the sermons, but of the actual sentiments of Mr Smith. I am going to refer to his latest utterances on that point, and in placing these before the Assembly, it is but just to Mr Smith that the fact should be known that these did not come out only at the last moment, and under special pressure, but that, more or less explicitly, he had been explaining his views in a similar way all along. And now, then, bearing all this in mind, let me ask the attention of the House to the final answers which Mr Smith gave to the two questions which, at the suggestion of the committee, the Presbytery put to him, with a view to learn what his views on the points in dispute really were. These final answers were given at the meeting of Presbytery of the 19th November, and previous to the pronouncing of the sentence against which the appeal now before the Assembly was taken. My motion, which had just been made, went on, after reaffirming the censure pronounced on the sermons, to say, "that the attention of Mr Smith having been specially called, in terms of this report, to those passages in the sermons on which the foregoing sentence is based, and now understanding that he disclaims and rejects the views which the Presbytery consider these passages to convey, and that he adheres to those doctrines

of Scripture and the Confession of Faith with which the Presbytery have found the passages in question to be at variance, the Presbytery deem it unnecessary to take any further action in the case." Reference was made to the expression in this motion, "and now understanding." Dr Gibson and Dr Forbes both tried to make much of these words, as if they were baseless as to any knowledge which had transpired. My answer is, it had a basis of actual knowledge, partly in a fuller consideration of Mr Smith's previous explanations, and partly in a better knowledge of Mr Smith's real state of mind, which I had gained that very day in the Presbytery from himself. What he said to myself I knew he was ready to say in the Presbytery. Hence my motion. These, let it be observed, are the grounds on which my motion proposed that the Presbytery should let the case drop. I ask the Assembly to look at them, and to mark how carefully they protect and uphold the doctrine of the Church on the points in dispute. They give no uncertain sound. They let the Church and all men know, that if the matter was to be prosecuted no further, it was on the footing—not that the Church had, by one hair's-breadth, let down her doctrines towards the level of the erroneous views which the sermons appeared to set forth—but on the footing that Mr Smith disclaimed these erroneous views, as views he never held nor meant to teach—and that, as regards the doctrines in question, he stood on the same level with the Church herself. The motion, in which this state of things is so clearly brought out, be it remembered, was made in Mr Smith's hearing—was made on the avowed understanding that it correctly described his state of mind. Even, therefore, if he had done nothing more than give a tacit assent to it, by allowing it to pass in his presence without any sign of dissent, he would have been held, by all honourable men, as having consented to it. But Mr Smith did not follow that unmanly course. He, of his own accord, and before a single additional step had been taken in the discussion, read and handed in a statement in which, after a short preamble, he expresses himself thus:—"If I understand that substantially, though not formally, Dr Buchanan would have me to reaffirm my replies, given at the meeting in October, I can most frankly do so, and I now do so to this effect, namely—First, That I hold most firmly the immutability of all divine moral law, and that the Decalogue contains a divinely-authenticated summary of that law which is everlastingly binding, only that the New Testament contains a fuller and clearer statement of that law." Here I may allude to the case of Mr Wright of Borthwick, and the strong things said by Dr Gibson regarding his disclaimer. Surely a child can see the difference between a mere vague disclaimer like that of Mr Wright, of teaching anything at variance with the standards of the Church, and a specific disclaimer like that of Mr Smith, of certain doctrines imputed to him; and not that only, but a positive assertion of the opposite truths. The question of course remains—Has Mr Smith really said anything which amounts to what I have now described? This humbly appears to me to be the question on which the decision to be pronounced by the Assembly must ultimately turn. And here I may observe, that my friend Dr Forbes spent an entire hour and a half of his speech before he came to that point. (Laughter.) Had we been here to oppose the pronouncing of sentence of censure on the sermons, that long pleading would have been perfectly relevant; but as we were not here in that attitude, it was

so much good speaking thrown away. With regard to Dr Gibson's speech, which I may venture to say was not quite so consecutive as that of Dr Forbes—(laughter)—a great deal of what he said had absolutely no relevancy whatever to the question before the Assembly. Now, I ask the Assembly to say whether what I read is not an affirmative and sufficient answer to the question the Presbytery itself put to Mr Smith on this head, viz., "Did the Ten Commandments, as given from Sinai, and summed up in the two great precepts of perfect love to God and brotherly love to man, contain a revelation of the law of God, binding on Christians, and one that is comprehensive of all moral duty?" I don't believe there is a man in this Assembly who, with that answer before him, would find it possible to frame a libel charging heresy against Mr Smith on the subject of the moral law. But further, Mr Smith, in the statement I am now quoting, went on to say—"Second, that the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments are the Word of God and the only rule of faith and manners; and further, that their organic relation is of such a nature that the Old Testament does not derive its authority from the New, but both have the same kind of authority, and that both taken together are the complete revelation of the Divine will." Again, I ask the Assembly to say whether that is not an affirmative and sufficient answer to the question which the Presbytery itself put to Mr Smith on this head, viz.—"Are the Scriptures of the Old Testament (with the requisite allowance for what is stated in the Confession as to ceremonial and judicial statutes) still authoritative in themselves, for the establishment of doctrine and the inculcation of moral duty, irrespective of any fresh sanction or enforcement of them in New Testament Scripture?" Again, I repeat that I don't believe there is a man in this Assembly who, with that answer before him, would venture on the attempt to bring a charge of heresy against Mr Smith with respect to the authority of Old Testament Scripture, or to the relation in which it stands to the New Testament Scripture? And especially I ask this Assembly—and I ask it with confidence—to say whether it was right or wise on the part of the Presbytery of Glasgow, with these explicit declarations of Mr Smith before them, to keep this painful case open, and still to insist "on the retraction and disavowal" of statements which these very declarations, if they have any meaning at all, do in reality set aside. Mr Smith, in the closing sentence of the paper in which these declarations are made, himself expressly says that he "unhesitatingly disclaims any opinion at variance with these truths, which have been ascribed to me as supposed to be taught in my sermons." Is it really necessary—is there any call of duty—to insist on more than this? If we don't believe that Mr Smith means what he says, let us openly bring the charge of dishonesty against him. But if we confide in his honour and integrity—as I am sure both sides of the bar and all the members of this House do—I do hope, and confidently believe, the Assembly will save Mr Smith from a demand which, with his views, he could not but regard as an injustice, and save itself at the same time from doing what could be hardly less painful to the Assembly than to him. That Mr Smith used language in his sermons fitted to mislead, and which he had not well considered, is abundantly plain. That he is himself not unwilling to admit that it may be so—or even that it must be so—is a fact, which in dealing with the question of retraction, the Assembly ought specially to remember. So long ago as the month of May of

last year, in the statement he then read to the Presbytery, he expressed himself thus :—" In the outset, permit me to say that if I have given any just cause for misunderstanding, I do most sincerely regret to have done so. It would be false in me to say that I feel conscious of expressing myself in such a way as that honest and single hearts, familiar with my manner of thought, would possibly mistake my meaning as it has been mistaken. I cannot say that, for that would not be fact. But neither can I suppose that those brethren of the committee who have ascribed to me views which I certainly do not entertain, did this from any unfairness, or without having, as they supposed, ground for their opinion in the discourses complained of. I presume, therefore, that as a man is apt to be somewhat blind to his own shortcomings, I must have somehow failed to express myself with sufficient precision, and have spoken so as to justify these misunderstandings. I regret extremely that I should have done so."

Moderator, have not these words in them the essence of retraction, even as regards the language on which this whole case proceeds? Will this House consent, in these circumstances, to affirm a sentence which will bind, not the Presbytery of Glasgow merely, but this House itself, to go through with the whole demand for literal retraction at the expense of whatever issues that offensive and unnecessary course may, nay, must involve? I will not believe it. It will be noticed that in the passage from Mr Smith's second statement which I have quoted, he makes special reference to those who are "familiar with his manner of thought" as not likely to put the kind of construction upon his words which the Presbytery had put upon them. In so speaking he was obviously alluding to his own people. Now, I honestly confess that I am considerably more inclined to attach weight to that statement than once I was. I certainly was not familiar with Mr Smith's manner either of thought or expression. I am not sure that I have ever heard him preach. Hearing a brother minister preach is a privilege we ministers too seldom enjoy. But I now see and know that Mr Smith, with great mental freshness and force, combines a certain dramatic power which tempts him at times to seek effect, at the expense of doing damage to the very truth he means to teach. A novel, startling, sensational way of saying things betrays him, I have no doubt, at times into exaggerations of expression not very easily distinguishable from errors, at least by those who are not, as he says, "familiar with his manner of thought." In saying this I don't mean at all to admit that there is enough, or even anything in the intellectual peculiarity now alluded to, to justify those statements in the sermons which the Presbytery have condemned. I mean only this, that there is something in it which helps me to understand how he might be able to persuade himself that those who are used to his way of handling things would see less in the sermons to find fault with than the Presbytery did. In common with the public at large, I have had quite lately an opportunity of becoming much better acquainted with the main drift and tone of Mr Smith's preaching than I did before. The very publication of that volume is eminently illustrative of those mental peculiarities at which I have been gently hinting as characteristic of Mr Smith. To any one but himself it would, of course, have occurred, that to publish discourses which his Presbytery have formally censured is of the nature of an act of contumacy. It would be very easy to represent it as an appeal, while the case is still *sub judice*, from the Presbytery to

the public, and as, so far, a defiance of his ecclesiastical superiors. But I don't believe Mr Smith meant anything of that kind. My conviction is, that in taking this very irregular step his real object was that which he himself puts forward in his preface—namely, to put the Church “in possession of the whole matter, on which her Courts have still to decide.” It is fair the Assembly should know that, so far from wishing to conceal what he had done in this respect from the Church Courts, Mr Smith had tried, through both the Synod and Presbytery, to get the volume brought before this Assembly. And here, let me say in passing, that whatever the Church may think it necessary to do in the way of censuring the publication of the volume will, I hope, be done by this Assembly—and not left as a peg on which to hang a new and vexatious case in the Presbytery of Glasgow. But I feel, Moderator, that I have already trespassed too long on the patience of the Assembly, and must now conclude. Mr Smith has great gifts for the work of the ministry, and for the edifying of the body of Christ. No man of Christian intelligence and candour can read that whole series of discourses now alluded to without having this conviction deeply impressed on his mind. My firm belief is, that this case—trying and painful as it must needs have been—if rightly dealt with by the Assembly, if dealt with in the exercise of that combined faithfulness and tenderness with which discipline in such a case ought ever to be exercised—will be, in God's gracious hand, a means of real and lasting good, both to the Church and to Mr Smith himself. But, if on the other hand, by refusing to sustain the appeal, and to reverse the sentence which we have brought up for review, the Assembly shall commit itself to a course of undue and uncalled-for severity, I can look only for consequences deeply injurious alike to Mr Smith and to this Church. To dismiss our appeal, and to sustain the sentence of the Presbytery complained of, can have no other issue but a libel,—or, what is still worse, deposition for contumacy. The very nature of the ground on which Mr Smith has taken his stand makes the retraction of the sentence of the Presbytery demands a thing he cannot agree to. To force him, in these circumstances, into what must be construed and treated as an act of ecclesiastical disobedience, would be to outrage the feeling of a large part of the Church, and of the whole onlooking public outside of it. If, on the other hand,—shrinking from so summary and so odious a method of terminating this case,—the Presbytery should go on, as they must then do, to bring against Mr Smith a formal charge of heresy, they have and can have no choice but to do it by libel. Dr Gibson, at the bar, has plainly hinted that this must follow. And how, in the face of the explanations Mr Smith has given to the Presbytery, such a libel is to be even drawn up, much more how it is to be proved, I cannot well conceive. These explanations they cannot possibly ignore. And how can they, with any show of reason or justice, lay it down as one of the two minor propositions of their libel, that Mr Smith is chargeable with the heresy of denying the independent authority of Old Testament Scripture, and that equally with the New Testament it constitutes an essential part of God's own inspired revelation of His holy will, in the face of his own express declaration that the Old Testament does not derive its authority from the New, that they have both the same kind of authority, and that both taken together are “the complete revelation of the divine will,” and “the only rule of faith and manners?” And, again, how can they

with any show of reason or justice, lay it down, as the other of the two minor propositions of their libel, that Mr Smith is chargeable with the heresy of denying that the Ten Commandments, as given from Sinai, contains a revelation of the law of God binding on Christians, and that is comprehensive of all moral duty, in the face of his own express declaration that he holds "most firmly the immutability of all divine moral law, that the Decalogue contains a divinely authenticated summary of that law which is everlastingly binding." How can the Presbytery, in such circumstances, frame such a libel? And if they do frame it, and go to proof upon it, what can come of it but discredit and confusion to the Presbytery itself? Sir, I should tremble at the very thought of this venerable House coming to a decision that must of necessity place, not the Presbytery of Glasgow merely, but the Assembly itself, in the long run, in so utterly false and untenable a position. For of this there cannot be a doubt, that to get up, in the circumstances I have described, even the appearance of making good such a libel, would compel any court that took the task in hand to have recourse to such torturing of a man's words, and to such forcing of other meanings than his own upon them, as might perhaps be harmonised with the usage of a Papal inquisition, but which I hope never to see attempted in a Protestant and Presbyterian Church. Let me entreat the Assembly, however, to keep the fact fully before it, that to dismiss our appeal and to affirm the sentence of the Presbytery of which we complain would be to embark on a course that must inevitably force the Church on one or other of the two equally fatal issues which I have now described. That the Assembly will pronounce a decision pregnant with such ominous results I do not for a moment believe. And relying as I do, with the utmost confidence, upon the wisdom and the justice and the generous consideration of this House, I leave the case, without one feeling of anxiety or apprehension, in your hands; and praying that the God of all grace and wisdom may now guide His servants in this Assembly to do that which is right. (Loud applause.)

The MODERATOR then said—I may intimate at this stage that I have received a communication from some members of the House stating that it is impossible for them to find accommodation in consequence of the presence in the body of the House of those who are not members, and that they will be constrained consequently, unless relief is found, to withdraw under protest that they are not permitted to judge in this case. (Hear, hear.) I venture to suggest to those in the body of the House who are not members that they should withdraw. (Applause.)

Sir HENRY MONCREIFF having asked if there were any questions to be put to the parties at the bar,

Mr CAMERON, Renton, said that Dr Buchanan in his speech had referred to a statement made by Mr Smith, in consequence of which he had withdrawn his motion. He (Mr Cameron) should like to know what the statement was, as Dr Buchanan had not repeated it.

Dr CANDLISH remarked that it was not on the record, and could not be dealt with.

Dr BUCHANAN said it was impossible for him, at this distance of time, to recollect what the exact words were, but they were such as to make Mr Smith's statement less strong than he (Dr Buchanan) had thought.

Mr BALFOUR, Holyrood, said a statement had been made that the

decision of the Presbytery had startled Professor Douglas, and he accounted for it by the fact that the Presbytery were engaged in the discussion of the case at midnight. Now, that might have been a reason for their being dreaming and sleeping, but on the record that did not appear, but it did appear on the record that these statements were made, which was the cause of the withdrawal of the motion.

Professor DOUGLAS replied that he did not say that he was startled. He had said that he was absent from the meeting in consequence of illness, and that he had never been able to learn precisely what the statements were; but knowing that the Court had sat for some twelve hours, they might have got involved in some confusion at the late hour, and for that reason he had asked that Mr Smith's statement on 19th November should be engrossed in the minutes, though it had been said to-day that the placing of this on the minutes was a step that ought not to have been taken.

Parties were then removed.

Professor RAINY said—I rise with a great sense of responsibility on this occasion. Speaking after, I think, fully eight hours' pleading at the bar, I do feel perplexed and overwhelmed somewhat with the nature of the task which devolves on me; and I must at once say, and it will relieve the House to know, that I must deal with it by resolutely simplifying it, and by refusing to go through the case in the manner in which in other circumstances a judicial case of this kind should be gone through, in a speech delivered by a member as one of the judges in the case. I could not do that without, among other disadvantages, usurping a proportion of the time of the Assembly which would be very unreasonable, and could only prejudice the right decision of the case by the House. One thing which relieves me is, that while the case is a case of perplexity, and that we must all feel, having regard to the fact that it has divided the Presbytery below, and that on either side there are names of so much weight, not merely those who have spoken at the bar to-day, but other ministers on either side who have the unqualified regard of the Church—I say, while we must feel the case has elements of perplexity, it is a great relief to feel there is no perplexity whatever about the doctrine which this Church holds, and the doctrinal principles on which this case has to be decided. Rumours are apt to float in connexion with cases of this kind, as if there were some screw loose in the minds of more than those that are in the case itself. I have had pretty good opportunity of falling in with ministers of this Church of various classes and different degrees of standing; and while I have met with some diversity of view as to the precise impression to be formed of Mr Smith's position in the case, and of the result of the case as bearing upon him, I have met with no difference of opinion whatever, no shadow of a difference of opinion, about the doctrinal principles that ought to be applied as the foundation of any decision that is arrived at. (Applause.) I am not now, after the pleadings at the bar, going to resume or set before the House any outline of the case. I wish merely to take it along with me, as I proceed, that the case has one marked turning-point. Mr Smith brought his sermons, by a statement, before the Presbytery. The Presbytery appointed a committee that reported. Mr Smith made a second statement, and the Presbytery's committee made another report, and then the turning-point took place. The Presbytery appears to have come to the

conclusion that there was in Mr Smith's mind as explained an incoherence and inconsistency of statement that must probably be due to the attempt on his part to represent favourably certain expressions and views that the Presbytery were persuaded he had unadvisedly and improperly put forth, and to make them out to be capable of a meaning in which they might be defended. The Presbytery thought that to disentangle the case, it was right to separate these elements; and, accordingly, having made up their minds about the sermons and their teachings, disapproved of, and censured them, and then they turned to take up the state of Mr Smith's mind. Now, the first thing that comes before us in this case is the sermons,—and in the committee's report two points are fixed on with regard to the moral law, its perpetuity, and with regard to the relations of the Old Testament to the New Testament Scriptures. With respect to these two points the Presbytery found that Mr Smith's teaching, taken in its natural sense, and according to the impression it was fitted to make on those who heard the sermons, must be taken to have been, as to the first, that the moral law was abrogated or annulled and superseded;—and that in this sense—that the New Testament version of it, so to say, was that to which we were to look as the form of it now binding upon us. Farther, that the Old Testament was itself annulled or superseded, or abrogated in this sense, or on this ground, that, however valuable its contents had been and continued to be, the New Testament takes its place now, and so fully reveals God's will and guides us in all relating to faith, worship, and duty, that we are to regard it as the normative authority, so to speak, of our faith and duty. Now, without dwelling on any of the passages in the sermons—without referring to those that I had marked for the purpose, for they have been so often referred to—I shall only say as to this, that I think on this part of the case there will be no doubt and no hesitation as to the propriety of the Presbytery's finding—that Mr Smith, whatever was on his mind, uttered himself on this subject in a manner fitted to make impressions and to convey ideas that could only carry men's minds in the direction I have now indicated. I think we shall be agreed that if there are in these sermons elements, expressions which indicate that some things were in his mind not consistent with that, they were not put in such a way as to relieve the Presbytery of the responsibility of disapproving and censuring the teachings of those sermons. And here I feel constrained, with some degree of pain on public grounds, and on some grounds personal to myself, to express my very strong feeling regarding the extremely unadvised tone and style that characterised these sermons. Apart just now from the question of what Mr Smith's design was—apart from the question of what the laity who heard it might think, who were accustomed to Mr Smith's style, who were not aware of the precise theological place and connexion of the topics handled—when I consider that a man of Mr Smith's intelligence and reading could not but be aware that on these important topics he deserted the mode of statement and style of treatment universal among sound divines, and when I consider that he certainly might have known that he was treading, in points of expression at all events, in the footsteps of a genealogy of errors—(hear, hear)—I am forced to say that, when I read these sermons, and when I have respect to the manner in which the sentiments contained in them are thrown out—in an easy, confident, and jaunty style, I do feel that here, as in some

other parts of the case, there is an element of irritation and provocation of which I have found some difficulty in relieving and discharging my mind, so as to confine myself strictly to the business which is now incumbent on us in looking simply at the merits of the evidence, and not allowing ourselves to be swayed by impulses of that kind. Sir, in the first place, as to the doctrines laid down in effect concerning the Old Testament Scriptures, I shall only read just one passage already referred to, viz., "It fulfils the ancient Scriptures, and in that very fact annuls them. We are no longer under the old economy, but under the economy which came by Jesus Christ. That New Testament contains in itself, and without mixture or addition from any other works whatever, a complete revelation of God's will for our salvation—the whole truth we are to believe—the whole law we are to obey—the whole rites of divine worship—the entire covenant of our redemption." I am not saying that there is not the element of explanation or the germs of such an element even in these sermons, but certainly there is nothing that is so put as to have the effect of clearly qualifying or controlling the impressions which statements of the kind are fitted to make. Here I may say what I ought to have said before, that I mean to take the two points of the case in their reverse order. I think that in logic, and especially in Mr Smith's own mind, the point with regard to the Old Testament and its relations to the New comes first. It was that which set Mr Smith's mind agoing in the whole case, and it is in that way I think we shall see through the case. It is to this point of the Old Testament then that I am speaking now. Turning from the teaching of the sermons to look at this part of the case as it comes before us now, the question with me is simply this, whether in the case as it stands before us we can go to libel; and whether, if we did go to libel, supposing that to be on other grounds possible, whether the libel could end in anything more or other, substantially, than what has been done already in censuring the doctrine of the sermons as doctrines which ought not to have been preached. And this question resolves itself into another. It resolves into the question as to the effect of that concluding explanation which has been so often referred to, and which, in so far as it refers to the subject now in hand, is to this effect, "That the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament are the Word of God, and the rule of faith and manners; and further, that their organic relation is of such a nature that the Old Testament does not derive its authority from the New, but both have the same kind of authority, and both taken together are the complete revelation of the divine will." I think, Sir, with respect to these explanations, the practical question is whether we are forced by the case as it lies before us in this record to regard these explanations as in fact, although not in intention, delusive and deceptive, and that mainly on the ground that we have evidence otherwise that Mr Smith could not mean to say what he here seems to mean to say in this concluding explanation. That seems to me to be the question. It is possible (and I think it is the case upon this point) it may be alleged, that if you take the whole case together, you cannot believe that this declaration means what it seems to mean on this head. Now, Sir, with respect to this, I shall simply state my impression of the case, for if I were to take any other course I must inevitably take up a great deal of time. In doing it as I am now going to do it, I shall expose myself, of course, to the imputation

of having chosen to state an impression without justifying it from the record. I must simply rely upon the knowledge of members of the House to judge whether my representation is a fair and feasible one—a possible one—a possible impression of the case which enables us to understand how Mr Smith, in this concluding explanation, has really *bona fide*, in fact as well as in intention, set our minds at rest as to his actual position in this important subject. Sir, my impression of the case is this—and I think the whole tenor of the record justifies it—Mr Smith's contemplation upon this matter began with considering how the danger of Judaizing—that is to say, of admitting under the Christian economy, elements merely Judaic and temporary—how this might be averted. He started with a very strong impression to the effect that the Church had suffered by mistake upon this point. And so far I decidedly agree with Mr Smith. I believe that it did enter early into the history of the Church; that within the times of the New Testament record itself, there had begun to be manifested mistakes of that kind, and that all down the stream of time since there has been a history of mistake upon the point—that a certain difficulty has been found in keeping men's minds right and clear upon that matter. Now, it is quite plain that it occurred to Mr Smith whether the right mode of setting the matter right might not be this—whether it might not be found that a satisfactory adjustment of the matter had been delayed, protracted, and put off by a wrong principle being assumed, or one that was not wholly a right one; whether the right version of it was not this, that instead of adopting the principle that that which the New Testament positively repealed by express statement or by implication, is to be regarded as Judaic, and is therefore to be excluded as part of that foreign element from the Christian dispensation; the right principle might not be that the New Testament positively sanctioned whatever was intended to be permanent, and that whatever had not that positive sanction was temporary and repealed. Might not the right way of running the march on this border land be to say, that the New Testament positively sanctioned and pointed out all that the Church was to take as permanent and as continuing into this economy. This idea might very naturally come up in anybody's mind thinking earnestly upon that subject, as an idea that one might test to see how it would work. If this were assumed and excogitated, it might next, as has apparently been done by Mr Smith, be turned into a theory, and the question is whether there is any point of view in this connexion, from which we may understand this sweeping statement of his about the Old Testament. Is there any aspect of the Old Testament as a whole with which we may connect it, so as to make it intelligible, without feeling that he has really broken loose, or intended to break loose, from the other statements which he afterwards affirms and repeats to the Presbytery as his existing belief? And can we carry this view through as we follow the course of his explanations in the record? Now he seems to have been looking at the Old Testament in this one aspect of it, namely, as it stands connected, all of it or nearly all, with the ancient economy. He was occupied with that subject, and allowed the whole of the Old Testament to stand before his mind for the time, as it regulated and bore upon the ancient economy; and, indeed, as not merely regulating an economy, but as very largely coloured throughout in its expressions and modes of revelation by the style of language and of

thought which that economy supplied. For it is not only in Levitical ordinances that we meet that old economy. Very largely indeed in psalms and prophecies faith is trained, and experience is expressed in language and by ideas which the economy itself supplied. It is an aspect, one aspect under which you may contemplate the whole of the Old Testament. Apparently Mr Smith allowed his mind to be completely possessed with this view of the subject, to the exclusion for the present of every other. And looking to our Lord's statement about the law and the prophets as the requisite hint or suggestion, he starts the theory that the Old Testament, which he is thinking of only as related to the economy, is annulled and abrogated, that the New Testament comes in its place, and that in this way we get rid of the difficulty that had so long puzzled and perplexed the Church. And with respect to the question which immediately arises—is there then nothing else in the Old Testament but this aspect of the case, that is to say, nothing but its relation to an economy under which its revelations are made? Is there no other aspect of it, in respect of which its authority and its materials must be sedulously preserved and vindicated? He assumes that he can cure any difficulty under that head—he takes it for granted that he can. He thinks he is sure to get rid of any injury that can be done to the authority of the Old Testament, because he observes that the Old Testament, in every important sense, is fulfilled in the New. He lays great stress upon that point. He assumes that, and places the case upon that point. And indeed, Sir, the very recklessness and heedlessness with which he puts out his theory here is to my mind a proof that he was looking at the whole matter only on this one side. It is a remarkable proof of the way in which his mind was working with reference to this subject. Hence in his very first statement he assumes that the case is exactly as I have now put it, and he speaks as if the only difficulty must be about the moral law, and that about nothing else can there be any important difficulty at all. He is in that state of mind, and he disclaims the comprehensive reference which the committee found in the sermons, and says it had respect only “to the laws and relations of the two economies,” or “to the documents in so far as they bore upon these.” Now, Sir, I believe that Mr Smith had nothing else prominently before his mind; but, if he had patiently considered the full logical range of his positions, and if his theory had been fairly tested, he would have found that it goes through the whole aspects of the Old Testament, and that you cannot intercept its operation on the whole, nor sustain in connexion with it the Church's doctrine regarding the rule of faith. But he does not think so. And he goes on to indicate, in connexion with his theory, what he relies upon to keep all these interests safe. He will show us how he can prevent any danger—any alteration in the attitude of the Christian mind towards the Old Testament and its teaching. While he thinks his theory will have this good effect, that it will purify the Christian Church from a Judaising tendency, he at the same time thinks he can save the theory from any injurious consequences which might occur through preventing the Old Testament from exercising its due influence upon the mind of the Christian believer. He says, accordingly, in the second statement, and I quote it only to show how the subject lay in his mind, “The question is, Are the Old Testament Scriptures the formal regulative documents

of the Christian dispensation, along with, and equal to, the New; or are they to this extent superseded, that any ordinance, law, or custom laid down in them is only of force when directly or by fair implication endorsed by the New Testament?" Then the Presbytery condemn the sermons—they say, we do not want any more to proceed, as if they could hold water—(a laugh)—because they manifestly teach a doctrine that requires our disapproval. But we want to know through another line of approach—clear of entanglement—what Mr Smith holds on this important subject; and accordingly you have the third statement. And in connexion with what I have said, I think you can understand Mr Smith's ground in that statement. The tone of that statement is certainly very unfortunate—(loud and general cries of "Hear, hear")—and unless you are prepared to exercise somewhat patient sympathy, it is provoking. There is a defiant tone about the whole statement—(renewed cries of "Hear, hear")—which I can only explain by supposing that Mr Smith was labouring under the conviction that the Presbytery were disposed to victimise him at all hazards, and therefore he had made up his mind to defy all consequences. But what Mr Smith says is this. He takes up that word "annulling," and the exposition which he gives of it is this, that you cannot apply it to anything in the Old Testament except law; and by the nature of the case you cannot apply it to the moral law, but only to law positive. I, however, think that the statements in these sermons cannot fairly be interpreted in that way. I think that as he put his theory in the sermons, the theory goes farther, and must go farther. It cannot help doing so. But I at the same time believe that in making this statement Mr Smith is perfectly frank; and I see no reason to believe that he is not stating what he intended. He is in fact saying, "This is what I hold, whatever may come of my statement." He still holds on to the idea of annulling, in so far as he applied it to law, and not to moral law, but to law positive. He is still disposed to hold on to that incoherent theory—(laughter)—but otherwise he is disposed to concede everything, whatever may become of his theorising. Now, it is through this line of approach that we are to look at Mr Smith's final statement. Mr Smith says, "that the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments are the Word of God, and the only rule of faith and manners; and, further, that their organic relation is of such a nature that the Old Testament does not derive its authority from the New, but that both have the same kind of authority, and that both taken together are the complete revelation of the divine will." Now, in the line of view which I have taken, I do not find any serious difficulty in believing that we ought to take this as a statement on Mr Smith's part of his views; and whatever may become of what I must call his most hasty and inconsiderate theorising in those sermons of his, we ought to look at it as saying that he means to maintain the view here expressed, and will not sacrifice it; that the rest may go, but that this must stand. I think it is very possible that Mr Smith may still have an idea in his mind that somewhere in the direction in which his sermons pointed there is a sort of something that will help or do some good in the matter of settling those questions about ceremonial and judicial law. I think that is very likely, but I do not think there is anything in his holding this that can fairly be understood to intercept or qualify the sense of the explanation in this

his final statement. With regard to Mr Smith's notion, and all forms of it, I suppose that this Assembly will generally believe that it is a perfectly groundless one, and that as soon as you try to form it into a theory, it becomes exceedingly perilous and dangerous. (Applause.) Mr Smith has not produced a shred or atom of evidence in support of the view which he has brought forward from the Old Testament or from the New. It is too unreasonable to suppose that the text upon which he was preaching has anything in that direction, and no other text has been produced on the subject. Whatever Mr Smith may think as to the advantage that will be gained by applying principles of this kind to the questions which principally occupied him, the truth is, that it is the manner of God in his revelations,—or if not always, then certainly it is His manner in His New Testament revelations, not to use such cut and dry methods of bringing men to certainty on such matters. The manner of Scripture throughout, and the manner emphatically of the New Testament dispensation, is not to act in this way, but to exercise men in understanding the application of principles. (Hear, hear.) It is not done by repealing or suspending the old, and by saying here is something new, but by furnishing principles which cannot be applied so as to get rid, at a blow, of all difficulty about judicial and ceremonial, moral and positive. Men must enter into them gradually and patiently, becoming trained to know their range and just scope by the discipline of failings and mistakes and corrections, perhaps through ages working to the perfect appreciation and the complete result. And then I may be allowed to make another remark ; and that is, that the theory of Mr Smith is a theory which really presupposes a position with respect to the Old Testament which he may not have designed to proceed on, but which is not the less truly required by it. It is this—that the Old Testament is throughout, in its whole structure, so entirely relative to a dispensation, an economy that is past, that there is no way of disentangling it, or its teaching, from that economy but by annulling it and introducing a new record, which re-embodies all its valuable and permanent contents. We are, however, to bear in mind that God was not only dealing with men under an economy, but He was dealing with man, His creature, about the matters that are ever in hand between God and man—about sin and about salvation. He was training the youth of that Church of which we are members still ; and as well might we put away the instructions which we received in our childhood as adopt any principle which would supersede the Old Testament. But there is another remark that must also be made with respect to Mr Smith's theory. It really proceeds on the idea that, when the Old Testament is compared with the New, the only thing to be said of the former is, that it is less full, less perfect, and less comprehensive. There is an aspect in which that is true. It was proportioned to a less perfect dispensation, it was the revelation of a smaller light ; but just because it was the historical beginning of the revelation of God, therefore there are aspects, there are uses, and there are teachings of the Old Testament's which are not in the New—in this sense, that the New presupposes and proceeds upon them, and does not proceed to reproduce them. That is my view of this part of the case ; and, holding this view, I regard the theory in the sermons in the light I have stated ; and yet, looking at it as such, I do not feel any difficulty in holding that the case of Mr Smith is not one of

substantial heresy, but of rashness, recklessness, and, I must add, of blundering—(laughter and applause)—and that it ought to be regarded in that point of view. I must remind the Assembly of the many evidences which we have of the extraordinary haste and precipitancy in his reasoning. We have, for example, among other instances, the argument about witchcraft, and that hasty mode of arguing from the economy to the record that regulated the economy. We have also the argument from the fulness of the New Testament revelations, as if we are to suppose that, even if the New Testament did in some sense reproduce all the Old, it must therefore supersede it—a marvellous leap in argument. (A laugh.) All this is proof of the extraordinary haste and inaccuracy that characterise the whole theorisings. Mr Smith was looking at the matter solely from one point of view. He has all along refused to admit as his intention what the Presbytery imputes to him, and what we think is the only impression his sermons could make; and I take him as stating that, whatever becomes of his theory, he holds the independent and co-ordinate authority of the Old Testament. The other point is in regard to the moral law. In regard to this point, perhaps, as it is now explained by Mr Smith, it is in my judgment of less practical importance, but perhaps it presents a little more difficulty. I must say that, in regard to the former point, I feel very clear that, in the circumstances, you cannot libel Mr Smith, unless you choose, through a process of libel, to affirm the very same which the Presbytery have pronounced already. But with respect to this matter of the law, there may be room for just a shade of doubt, and it requires, therefore, to be more carefully examined. Here it may be worth while to advert to the precise way in which our common position with respect to the law is related to the other question regarding the Old and New Testament. We all admit the perfection of the New Testament revelation in the sense of its being a fuller and clearer revelation of truth than was given at the time of the Old Testament dispensation, and in the sense of its including the abolition of those temporary ordinances and those carnal elements which have passed away in the time of the manhood of the Church. But in regard to the moral law, we make an exception. We refuse, in regard to it, to apply these principles of progress and addition. We say the moral law must be regarded in a different light. It must be regarded as something ever equal to itself, containing what is unchangeable through all dispensations, remaining one and the same in all ages. And when Mr Smith was putting this theory of his into his sermons, it evidently occurred to him, as it naturally might, what he was to make of the position which it had been usual to lay down on this matter; and, in particular, whether there was any decent and tolerable sense in which he could give his theory an application, or an apparent application, to that great element of the Old Testament, the moral law. Whether he could do this without endangering the perpetual obligation of moral law, which he says, and, I believe, he meant to maintain. It was a most testing question, for he had to conduct his theory so that, while maintaining the permanency of moral law, he could in a tolerable and decent manner hold that the Decalogue was annulled or superseded in the sense of being fulfilled. Mr Smith seemed to have supposed that he could find a sense in which that ground could be covered; and we find him brandishing his discovery with an air of triumph at the heads of the systematic theologians who

had ventured to defend the Fourth Commandment and the Sabbath-day without possessing the benefit of this new light. But I must say that I do wonder a little at the course he has pursued here. It is very well known, and might have occurred to Mr Smith, had he been lately refreshing his reading in any of those common books which combine some reference to the history of opinions with systematic divinity, that there was a very undesirable sort of genealogy of opinion in this direction with which any cautious man—but Mr Smith is not a cautious man—(laughter)—would not have been desirous to connect himself. It is very well known what were the views which the Socinians and the Antinomians and the Anabaptists held on this subject; and though Mr Smith did not hold these views, yet I think any man with any ordinary degree of caution might, with even the fever of his sermons on him, have paused. (Laughter and applause.) I think Mr Smith might have adverted, at all events, to the very substantial ground which in this matter is taken by our divines against Socinians and Anabaptists. I name these parties, but in doing so I do not mean to say that Mr Smith sympathises with the views which induced them to take up the ground they did with reference to the Decalogue. On the contrary, I believe that he has no sort of sympathy with them, and that he has an abhorrence of their principles on this point. I name these sects simply in order to state that this circumstance ought, I think, to have exercised a controlling influence upon him; but we know that when a sermon must be written it is very difficult to stop. (A laugh.) Mr Smith seems to have made up his mind, then, that there was a sense in which he could say that the Decalogue was so fulfilled as to be at the same time annulled. Well, on what ground did he find himself able to say so? I confess that in going through the case it occurred to me to wonder why Mr Smith should not have got over the difficulty by saying that the Decalogue was simply reproduced and reinstated, as it were, by the New Testament. There are very good grounds for saying that it was so even from Mr Smith's point of view, from the way in which the Decalogue is cited and referred to in the New Testament. That, therefore, might occur as solution. But then you must observe how extremely odd it would be to say that it was annulled and reproduced in terms at the very same moment. The thing was ridiculous, and therefore it was absolutely essential that Mr Smith should find another way of stating the matter. He thought he could maintain his position by having recourse to two distinctions—a distinction of form and a distinction of measure—that in the form there is a difference in the New Testament revelation of law, and in the measure there is a greater fulness. Now, with regard to one of these, that of form, I don't think there is a great deal to be said, when one takes a reasonable view of Mr Smith's meaning. There is, I mean, no material difficulty arising from this quarter in the way of accepting his ultimate statement on that head. Mr Smith has referred to another form which the revelation of law assumed, and that under the Old Testament, namely, the great law of love: he owns that to have been revealed, though he was inclined, at one time at any rate, to think that this law is in some sense more comprehensive than the Decalogue. I wonder whether if it never occurred to him that the one did not supersede or abrogate the other. Did these not stand together, throwing light upon each other, the one entering into the matter by the side of virtue, and the other by the side of

duty? I don't greatly object to a man saying that you have the law in the one form in the Decalogue, and in another and even in a certain sense in a higher form in the New Testament, if you mean that there it comes before us more amply and luminously clothed with gospel. But the great principles which regulated our divines all along in taking up their position were such as these—that when God created man, man was created the subject of an eternal law, and that this duty which pertains to man stands before us immutable and eternal. We hold that this being so, God has been dealing with man under that law, and according to it, and that he has never consented to deal with man otherwise than as according to the glorious law of duty, nor given man reason to think that he would deal with him according to any lower standard. And when God came in a special manner to place his people under a dispensation in which law was to be heard and take place as it never had done before, we believe that it was the glorious form of that same eternal law which rose from amid the thunders of Sinai, looking back to the original of man as God had made him and had placed him in relation to the various beings around him—looking forth upon the sinners whom it condemned for their transgressions—and looking forward to the glorious fulfilment which it was to find in the coming Saviour, and the love and obedience with which it should be cherished by all that are redeemed in Him. I believe Mr Smith never meant to deny that: Moderator, I am most willing to believe it; but I do wish he had found a place for it in his sermon, along with whatever crotchets he liked to start. But as I say he resorted to this distinction, “form and measure.” Now, with regard to “measure,” what Mr Smith means is quite clear. As far on as to his third statement we still find him clinging, in a certain sense, to this fuller revelation of the moral law. When you look at the duties he refers to—missions and forgiveness, and things of that kind—it is perfectly clear what the idea in his mind was. Sometimes I have thought it would have been cleared up to him if any one had said to him—We are not bound to deny by our principles anything historically true. We grant that the law of nature was not in man's heart before the fall as a set of detailed maxims applicable to all relations into which he might come; but he was to enter into the fulness of the law as the meaning of life developed its fulness and variety, and multiplied into fresh relatives, and so doing he would find that the law which he already had was being multiplied for him all along his daily life. In the same way with the Decalogue. It is not a law that you can circumscribe and measure with a “thus far and no farther.” If the duties of certain relations have a prominent place in it, yet it is very far from being a mere catalogue of duties, to be set over against another catalogue of virtues, or a third catalogue of goods, according to the division of ethics which some espouse. Simple as its structure is, and its order—yet through that structure and order it proves very deep and complex, going down far under foot—spreading out wonderfully as you walk by it. It contains the eternal law: contains it in this sense, that entering into it you will find it ever expanding and growing on you; but not in the sense that it expounds or enumerates in detail the duties of all possible relations. Whatever respect it manifestly has to the fallen state of man, and to the fact that God was carrying on a scheme of grace, yet, it is the primitive nature and duty of man that is especially regarded. That, as Professor Gibson very well

showed, is the key-note, the law of nature is reproduced. But man was to be brought into other relations. He was, for instance, to be brought into relations with a Redeemer. Well, I believe all duty to a Redeemer does on a certain side fall under law, the law of love, the law of the Decalogue; but manifestly that rendering one's self to the Redeemer, and cleaving to Him, is a thing not on the surface of the Decalogue, but to be opened up as the divine principles unfold and the duty of man evolves in connexion with the experiences into which man was to be brought and the course he was to accomplish. That does not interfere at all with the position we have always taken up with regard to the essential unity, perpetuity, and permanence of the one moral law that rises between God and man, as soon as God has made man in the image of God. That being so, I really think it is a somewhat narrow point, in regard to which it may be said to be doubtful whether Mr Smith's last statement really covers the ground. It is, I admit, not perfectly clear, whether even yet he means to say that the law, as revealed in the Decalogue, is really essentially the same as that which continues to be revealed, and which regulates our duty under the New Testament. Still the difference comes into very narrow compass. Mr Smith has admitted that the law of love covers the whole ground; and therefore you have him at this point, that the moral law itself was revealed to Adam—was revealed under the Old Testament, at all events; and if he holds that, I do not see room for much more than a dispute about words, and about the statement of certain things about which we are substantially agreed. At all events, it would be a narrow point to libel on. I have said that Mr Smith admits that the law of love, revealed under the Old Testament, covers the whole ground of moral duty. I am aware that it is disputed whether he really holds this; but I don't remember that any ground is alleged for doubting it except that one matter of an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth. With respect to that, it has been said that Mr Smith withdrew the illustration but not the principle. But he did withdraw the principle, in as far as he withdrew the statement that the principle of revenge might be said to be inculcated. But if you look into it a little further, what is it he has in his mind? It is very much this, that under the Old Testament dispensation there were certain regulations that recognised a course of conduct on the part of the people, as what might go on under the theocracy; and that is what he refers to when he says that "while the great law of love to God and man was certainly declared at Sinai, yet in its practical application it was for wise, however inscrutable, reasons, subjected to various restrictions, so that the people of Israel did not fail in its observance merely because of their perverse will, nor yet merely because they had not quite so much light as we have, but because, in point of fact, there was positive statute authorising them to do in some cases what we must acknowledge to be repugnant to the law of perfect love." That is what he holds. Now, I never could adopt that principle myself. But yet we must acknowledge that the precise statement—if you choose not merely to make a general statement, but to go through it in detail—the precise statement of the principle by which you are to extricate all these particular cases, is not an easy problem. There are considerable difficulties; and, in point of fact, divines have differed not a little as to the particular way of explaining. These cases, in which some things seem to be sanctioned, or permitted, or not excluded, which

yet we know to be excluded now, fall under that part of the moral law which has been distinguished as moral in a second sense, and not in the first—that is, the morality is not that which arises directly out of the relation of man to God, but it is that which arises out of the relation of man to his fellow-creatures on earth. Now in regard to this, some divines have held that, within some limits, God retains within His own hands a dispensing power in such cases; because the reason of the law in given circumstances has altered, He alters the law for so long as He sees good, and He only is entitled to do so. I do not think this is a safe principle to apply to these cases; but I do not think we are entitled to decide that it is heretical to hold that that may be the explanation—viz., that God was pleased, for wise reasons, in existing circumstances, to exercise His dispensing power, so that by reason of the dispensation that took place, a certain thing did not then take the character which now in our own day it does take under the perfect law of love, as Mr Smith says. I repeat, I do not think it a safe way of stating it; but I am not prepared to say that it is a mode that can be shut out authoritatively. I believe we could produce the evidence of divines of good repute pointing to that as at least an alternative explanation. I think, therefore, this concluding statement may be accepted as a *bona fide* statement on Mr Smith's part, not only in intention, but in fact. And looking at it in this point of view, when I look to the report of the majority of the Presbytery, I am obliged to say that I do not think in the line they indicate this case can ever be extricated with advantage to the Church, to Mr Smith, or to the cause of truth. I think it clear that the only course under that proposition will be, with a shorter or longer delay, to libel; and I have given you my reasons for thinking that a libel will break down, if it is proposed. I think further, that the report of the Presbytery is not quite so accurate and discriminating as I should like the Assembly to authorise the Presbytery to proceed upon in dealing with Mr Smith and calling for a retraction—if, indeed, it be constitutional to call for a retraction before he is served with a libel, and that libel is proved. (Hear, hear.) I think the reasons for that were indicated at the bar with substantial justice. In regard to the effect on Mr Smith's mind, I cannot see the possibility of a good result from following out the line taken by the majority of the Presbytery. My own belief is, that the case is one of theorising carelessly and hastily in a couple of sermons, and that it is a very different case from that of Wright of Borthwick. Mr Smith himself immediately brought the sermons before the Presbytery, and they speedily arrived at that explanation, which, I think, ought to extricate the case. I have the strongest impression that if the General Assembly could see to the bottom of Mr Smith's mind, they would find nothing more there than I have indicated in connexion with this concluding explanation. But supposing that I am believing too much on the ground of my own previous knowledge of Mr Smith, suppose it should be the mind of the Assembly that there is a tendency in Mr Smith's mind leading him unconsciously in a wrong direction. If that is to be so, it lies in the future, and your business is to take such a course now as will enable you to deal with that most effectually, if ever it comes. And I not only pray God, but I do express my personal confidence that it will not come. If it does, you ought to take that course which will enable you to deal with Mr Smith so that all men will say that you have taken

action not hurriedly, not doubtfully, and not dividedly. That last consideration ought not to regulate our decision, but it may have some weight—I mean, that if you can meet the substantial justice of the case you should do so with the undivided strength of the Assembly. The only other thing I have to say is, that I think it necessary in my motion to take notice of the characteristics of this case in so far as it is marked by what I have ventured to call—without intentional discourtesy to Mr Smith—blundering in connexion with his theorising on the subject. For on the second point we find marks of inconsiderate statement, quite as prominent as those I pointed out in connexion with the first. You have the argument from the rule of “an eye for an eye,” that from the defects and lower attainments of Old Testament believers, that from the things permitted under the theocracy, that from the first commandment in connexion with the unity and the trinity in Godhead, that from the fifth commandment, that from the seventh, and that from the assertion that the Decalogue was not given to Adam, which certainly appears to me to be the strangest quibbling. All these have a common character of irrelevancy and inconsiderateness which give a peculiar colour to the whole case, and I do not think we can dispose of it properly, unless we take serious notice of these peculiarities. My motion is as follows:—

“The General Assembly sustain the complaint, reverse the sentence of the Presbytery of Glasgow complained against, and—First, find that the two sermons of Mr Smith brought before the Presbytery contain statements with respect to the moral law and Old Testament which are at variance with the Confession of Faith and the teaching of Scripture. The General Assembly accordingly confirm the finding of the Presbytery of Glasgow, at their meeting on 12th September last, disapproving and censuring the said sermons. But in respect that the statements submitted by Mr Smith in explanation, specially that laid before the Presbytery on 19th November 1866, warrant the General Assembly in holding that Mr Smith’s views are in substantial accordance with the teaching of the Confession of Faith, and that he disclaims the contrary doctrine which various passages in the sermons have been found by the Presbytery and the Assembly to convey—they find it unnecessary to take further judicial action in this case. Second, having regard to the importance of the doctrines set forth in our Confession with respect to the perfection and authority of the moral law as revealed in the Old Testament, and especially as summed up and set forth in the Decalogue—and also with respect to the Old Testament Scriptures as constituting, along with the New, not only an inspired record of God’s revelation, but the authoritative rule of faith and manners—the General Assembly feel called upon to express their sense of the serious character of the errors which the statements in the sermons convey, although Mr Smith disclaims the intention of teaching these errors. Further, they have observed with pain and regret indications on the part of Mr Smith of his not having sufficiently considered the responsibility that attaches to the publication in the pulpit of theories on the important topics referred to—theories which bear the marks of having been hastily assumed, and which, even on Mr Smith’s own showing, were incompletely thought out in their bearings and consequences, were supported by statements speedily withdrawn as erroneous, and requiring most serious modification in order to make them even seem consistent with the views which Mr Smith declares that he all along entertained.

The General Assembly enjoin Mr Smith to avoid for the future statements and expressions such as have given occasion to these proceedings, and they seriously and affectionately admonish him to cherish henceforward a deeper sense of the humility and caution which it becomes the preachers of the Word to manifest in delivering instruction to the flock of Jesus Christ."

Dr Rainy also read an addition to the motion which he would move, if it were the mind of the Assembly that he should do so. The addition was to the effect of condemning the publication of the volume "The Sermon on the Mount," but declaring it to be unnecessary to take any steps in regard to it, believing that Mr Smith had published it without adverting to the impropriety of publishing what had been censured by the Presbytery. This addition, however, Dr Rainy did not move.

Rev. Mr MACGREGOR of Paisley said, I have much pleasure in seconding the motion of Dr Rainy. It is already appearing that our Synod was wisely guided in resolving to refer the case for judgment: it would have been worth all the trouble, with reference to matters so important, to have had so noble a speech as we have listened to, addressed to so noble an audience. After apologising and accounting for his absence from the bar in the morning, Mr M. proceeded:—

It has been rightly stated from the bar, that the hinge of the case is in the question of fact:—Has Mr Smith repudiated the errors originally found in his sermons by the Presbytery, regarding the authority of Old Testament Scripture, and the perfection and perpetual obligation of the Old Testament moral law? And this question I find answered in the fourth and last statement of Mr Smith to the Presbytery. In their answers to reasons of dissent, the Presbytery say that that statement was not received by them till after a certain motion had been tabled and advocated by Dr Buchanan. But this allegation is merely *ad hominem*. It is irrelevant to the dissent and complaint. For the statement had been received before the Presbytery adopted the resolution dissented from. It therefore was a competent ground of dissent against that judgment. It therefore now is a competent ground for us to proceed in review of that judgment. And I say that the statement brings Mr Smith before us in the act of publicly repudiating at last the two errors which the Presbytery found in his discourses at the first.

The more general part of the statement, with reference to the Old Testament Scripture, is perfectly and conclusively clear: in the light of previous proceedings, no intelligent man could honestly make that statement if he did not in his heart believe the catholic doctrine of our Confession on the point. The more special part of the statement, with reference to the Old Testament moral law, is not so perfectly clear and unambiguous. Its terms, in strict logic, are susceptible of an interpretation at variance with the catholic doctrine of our Confession on this point; and if Mr Smith had been a dishonest man, capable of using words for the purpose of concealing his mind under pretence of revealing it, then he might have been suspected of having here left himself an open back-door through which, at some future time, he might slink into the heresy of affirming, either that the Old Testament revelation of moral law is imperfect, or that the Decalogue is not a code of moral laws binding all men in all ages and nations. But we are bound to regard our Christian brother as a gentleman, incapable of the baseness of a white lie.

We are bound to accept his statements in the sense which, in the circumstances, they are manifestly fitted and intended to convey. I therefore regard Mr Smith as here, too, formally accepting the catholic doctrine of our Confession; and I hold that his fourth and last statement brings him before us in the act of repudiating the two errors which the Presbytery repeatedly and unanimously found him to have preached.

I am very thankful to be able to rest in this conclusion; for if Mr Smith had not repudiated those errors, his position would have been exceedingly grave, both for him and for us; for the doctrines which the Presbytery originally found him to have impugned are of real and vital importance. That they are so in the estimation of our Church, is shown by the fact that they have a place in her Confession, among those articles of Christian faith which, in her estimation, all Christian Churches are bound to maintain, and all Christian ministers are bound to proclaim and defend. And this opinion is not peculiar to our Church, or to the Puritan Churches, or to the Reformation Churches: it is the common opinion of the whole Christian world: the doctrines in question have the same place in the creeds and confessions of the Churches in general, Romanist and Protestant alike. And the Catholic Church has not drifted into this opinion by any inadvertency or accident, but has been led to embrace it and cherish it by a long and varied experience of its soundness.

Thus in the experience of the modern Church, before the doctrines were inscribed on our Confession, the matter of them both had been thoroughly sifted through generations of controversy, between Socinians on the one hand and Christians on the other. No Scripture argument has been recently alleged against them that was not advanced by Socinians and repelled and exploded by Christians, no end of times, hundreds of years ago. For example, Mr Smith has affirmed, against the doctrines in question, that the Lord Jesus in the New Testament is and must be a legislator, revealing a new law, as if this had been an unquestionable matter of course. But in fact this is but one form of stating the Socinian position as opposed to the orthodox. Under one aspect, the Socinian position was, that Christ in the New Testament is a legislator, revealing a new law; while the Christian position was that He is not and cannot be a legislator in the New Testament, because the old law is perfect, His work of legislation is completed in the Old Testament. Again, Christians went on for generations challenging Socinians to produce from the New Testament one atom of moral legislation that is not given in the Old. And one reason why this point was so long and keenly contested on both sides is this, that on both sides it was felt and confessed that the maintenance of this point is vitally important for the defence of the whole Christian system, as opposed to the Socinian system. The Socinian system made Christ to be merely a Reformer, reforming our life by revealing a new law. The Christian system, on the other hand, made him to be a Redeemer, redeeming our lives by fulfilling the old law, for us on the cross, and in us by His Spirit. And thus, in the experience of the modern Church the doctrines are vitally important, not only in themselves, but also and specially as bulwarks of the whole Christian system of redemption by Christ, as opposed to the Socinian system of mere reformation by Christ.

So, too, in the experience of the ancient Church. The doctrines now in

question were the hinge of her grand debate with Manicheans within her borders. Marcion and others anticipated the Socinian premises, that the Old Testament moral law is imperfect, that the Old Testament Scripture is not for Christians a rule of faith and life. And from these premises they deduced the Manichean conclusion, that there are two gods, one evil and malignant, the other good and benignant; that the Old Testament Creator is not the same deity as the New Testament Redeemer, but is an unclean, malignant demon, from whose tyranny the Redeemer has come to set us free. And thus, in the experience of the ancient Church as in that of the modern, the doctrines now in question have been found to be vitally important, not only in themselves, but as bulwarks in defence of the whole evangelical system of religion.

The same experience is being repeated in our day and land. All over Britain there is now in progress a sort of Sadducean revival. In England it presents some aspects of striking resemblance to the ancient Manicheism, particularly in its hatred of the Old Testament; while in Scotland it conforms to the type of that moderatism which is but another name for practical Socinianism. And both in Scotland and in England the movement against the heart of our religion is characterised by a preliminary assault against the doctrines now in question as its outposts. Thus in England, a deist, pretending to be a Christian bishop, has openly assailed the fundamental part of Old Testament Scripture; while in Scotland, some moderates, pretending to be evangelical ministers, have openly or covertly assailed the Old Testament law, in whole or in part. And even in Scotland we are beginning to learn the lesson of history, that an assault on any one part of that law will lead to a rejection of the law as a whole, and that he who rejects the Old Testament moral law cannot consistently stop short of rejecting the Old Testament Scripture which reveals it.

It is therefore a very grave offence in any Christian teacher to impugn those doctrines. Yet they were impugned in the sermons of Mr Smith. I wonder that any one should have doubted whether the sermons contain an assault on those doctrines. For, in fact, they contain nothing else. The assault on those doctrines is the very spirit of the life of the sermons; so that, if the assault be withdrawn, the sermons will collapse into a mere heap of meaningless words, or at best into a *cento* of disjointed truisms. The assault pervades the sermons all through, consciously or unconsciously, in root, and stem, and branches.

The *root* of the whole is found in Mr Smith's exegesis of his text. I do not wonder that Professor Douglas, a man who fears God and trembles at His word, regards that exegesis with a feeling approaching to horror. For the exegesis represents the Son of God as saying in one breath what He unsays in the next. The text begins with a very solemn warning of Christ against thinking that He has "come to destroy the law or the prophets." But Mr Smith's exegesis represents Him as going on to say in the next breath that He *has* come, in effect, to destroy them both in their essence. For "the law" is nothing unless it be a rule of life; and "the prophets" are nothing unless they be a rule of faith: while Mr Smith's position is, that the Old Testament law no longer binds men to do what it commands, and that the Old Testament Scripture does not bind men to believe what it says as true on the authority of God. This account of Mr Smith's exegesis is established by his own words in ex-

pounding his text. And it is amply confirmed by the argumentative process through which he endeavours to establish his view. His argument is this:—The “fulfilment” must be the same in effect with reference to the moral law as with reference to the ceremonial. But with reference to the ceremonial law, the fulfilment is in effect annulment or abrogation. Therefore, with reference to the moral law of the Old Testament, the fulfilment is equivalent to annulment. Now, what annulment is, is to be learned from the case of the ceremonial law. In that case, the abrogation of the law means that Christians are not bound to do what is commanded by it. And thus Mr Smith’s whole argumentative process is pointless, unless he mean to show that the Old Testament moral law is abrogated, in the sense of no longer binding men to obey it.

The *stem* is constituted by the two illustrations to which Professor Douglas has referred. Dr Douglas represents these illustrations as unfortunate. They are unfortunate only because the preacher was previously unfortunate. For they are perfectly fitted for their purpose, to make plain what the preacher really means. The one of them applies to the Old Testament Scripture in general; and represents it as a lamp light, very valuable in the night, but superseded in the daytime by the sun—that sun being constituted by the New Testament Scripture. This illustration shows that the doctrine of the sermons is contradictory of ours; for according to our doctrine, the Sun, the completed light, the fully manifested mind of God, is not in the New Testament exclusively, nor in any one part of Scripture exclusively, but in the whole Scripture, Old Testament and New Testament alike. The other illustration applies more particularly to the moral law of the Old Testament; and represents it as the rough draught of a will, while the will itself is constituted by some new revelation of moral law in the New Testament Scripture. But this, again, shows that the doctrine of the sermons is contradictory of ours; for according to our doctrine, the Old Testament moral law is the will itself, like the body of an Act of Parliament, declaring the whole mind of the legislator; while the New Testament Scripture in its bearing on the law is as the “interpretation clause” of that Act, not adding anything to what is contained in the body of the Act, but only enabling us to see what is the true import and due application of what is contained in that body.

The *branches* are constituted by his subsidiary arguments from Scripture and other sources. I will not now speak of his allusion to the philosophy of the subject, and the history of Christian thought on the subject, except to say that, in my estimation, they show that the author of the sermons had need of instruction rather than censure. I will now call attention only to some samples of his subsidiary arguments from Scripture.

For example, there is his appeal to the *lex talionis*—“An eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth.” Mr Smith has complained of the use made of this appeal, after he has fallen from it. Now, if the question had been, What is Mr Smith’s present opinion of the *lex talionis*, the complaint would have been rational. But the question is, What is the meaning of the sermons? What was the author’s state of mind when he preached them? And to this question, the fact of his appeal is as relevant as though he had still maintained that the *lex talionis* is part of the Old Testament moral law. The purpose of his appeal was to show that one part of the Old Testament

moral law is now ascertained to be immoral ; and the fact of his having had such a purpose in his preaching shows that the doctrine of his sermons is at variance at least with the doctrine of the perfection of that law.

Again, he appealed to "the two great commandments," as if in giving these Christ had formally superseded the Old Testament moral law. He here showed very astonishing ignorance of the letter of God's word. For if only he had looked at the contents of the New Testament passages in which those "two great commandments" occur, he would have seen that they are there given, not as superseding that law, but as expressing the substance and spirit of it ; and are thus given, not only by Christ, but also by a Jewish lawyer, avowedly in answer to the question, "What is written in the law ? How readest thou ?" And if he had consulted the margin of his Bible, he would have found that the "two great commandments," so far from being peculiar to New Testament Scripture, are there quoted *verbatim* from Moses in the Old. But the present question is, What did he mean by making that mistaken appeal ? And the answer is, he meant to show that the Old Testament law is in fact superseded by another law in the New Testament.

Once more, I find traces of the same sentiment in his statements. In one of them, for instance, he says that the Old Testament does not reveal "the moral duty of missions." Now this, on the face of it, is nonsense. A moral law as such is founded wholly in nature ; but missions, like the gospel, are founded wholly in grace ; so that to speak of "the moral duty of missions" is really to talk nonsense, to perpetrate a virtual self-contradiction in terms. Again, in the only sense which the statement can have been intended to convey, it is grossly untrue. For to Abraham and his seed it was revealed from the beginning, that in them all the families of the earth should be blessed ; provision was made for the reception of Gentile proselytes into the Church even under the old dispensation ; and that whole dispensation was under one aspect, a long *curriculum* of education to the Church as a missionary institute, preparing her to go forth, as she did go forth, in the fulness of time, under her glorified Christ, for the subjugation of the world to God by the gospel. But here, again, the question is, What was the purpose of Mr Smith in making that nonsensical statement ? And again the answer is : His only conceivable purpose was, to show that the Old Testament revelation of moral law is imperfect.

I am thoroughly persuaded that the two doctrines now in question, have been assailed in the sermons throughout. And I am therefore very thankful to find that the two errors first found in the sermons have been repudiated by Mr Smith ; for the doctrines not only have an important place in the history of Christian thought, they have a place not less important in Christian faith and life. Do you, for example, deny the perfection of the Old Testament moral law ? Then in the first place, whatever may be your intention, you cast a shade of grave doubt on the moral perfection of the Old Testament legislator, pointing to the Manichean conclusion that he is a devil ; and at the same time cast a shade of doubt on the perfection of the redeeming work of Christ, so far as that consisted in His fulfilling the law for us and in us. Second, you reject the only thing in Scripture that so much as appears to be a directory of detailed moral duty ; for there is no such directory in the New Testament. And

in the third place, you give occasion to question the divinity of that old Scripture in which the law is revealed.

Again, do you deny the permanent normal authority of that Scripture as divine? Then, in the first place, you reject the light of heaven on important matters which no other Scripture reveals, such as the morality of the Sabbath law, the degrees of affinity and kindred within which marriage is unlawful, and the obligation of nations to do what in them lies for the furtherance of the true religion. Second, you reject the blessed privilege of having God for your teacher in that Scripture with reference to all the great matters it reveals; such as the creation, preservation, and government of the universe; the history, destiny, and duty of nations under God; and the origin, early history, and permanent constitution of His Church. And third, you undermine the authority of the New Testament Scripture, and even of our Christian religion in its substance. For the two Scriptures, New Testament and Old Testament, are necessary to each other, like the two sides of a magnificent arch, sustaining the way of life eternal: they reciprocally support one another, they lean each on the other: so that if the independent foundation of either be withdrawn, both together will speedily fall in ruin to the ground. And the divine authority of the old Scripture is so frequently appealed to by Christ and His apostles, so systematically assumed by them as the basis of their instructions, that if that Scripture be found to have no real authority of its own as divine, then Christ and His apostles are found false witnesses concerning God and His word, and our preaching is vain, and the faith of our people is vain.

Dr BEGG—I should have wished that the House could come to a unanimous judgment on a question so very important as that now before us; but I regret to say it is quite impossible for me to concur in the motion of Dr Rainy, although I admire the ability of his speech. I may state very briefly, for at this late hour it would be inexcusable to detain the Assembly, the grounds upon which I cannot concur in his motion, and upon which I shall take the liberty to propose another motion. The case has come to us in the form of a dissent and complaint, made first to the Synod, and by the Synod referred *simpliciter* to the General Assembly. That dissent and complaint arose at a late stage of the proceedings in this painful case. In the earlier stages, as the House is now well aware by frequent repetition, all the members of Presbytery concurred—concurred in condemning these two sermons as containing statements opposed to the Word of God, and to the standards of the Church. I am not sure, however, that a sufficient expression has been given in regard to the very grave nature of the heresy which, in my opinion, is contained in these sermons. I dislike the sermons for what they do not contain almost as much as for what they do contain. I think there is a great absence of anything fitted to touch the consciences of men, and to guide them to the way of salvation in these sermons. (Applause.) It, moreover, seems to me that, in modern ecclesiastical history, nothing more grave in the way of a heresy has been put forth than the heresy which I think is contained in these sermons. (Hear, hear.) That heresy strikes at the foundation of the authority of God's law, and of His word. It tends to the subversion of two-thirds of the whole revelation of God, and, in my opinion, it is not only thoroughly unfounded, but, in fact, it proceeds upon an assumption the very opposite of the truth; for the Old Testa-

ment Scriptures are the true basis of the revelation of God, and our blessed Lord continually referred to them in confirmation of His own doctrines, and the apostles did the same. It seems to me that, if the slightest doubt is cast upon their authority, it will become impossible to interpret the New Testament, to interpret the Epistle to the Romans and the Galatians, or the Hebrews, or in any way fully to understand the New Testament Scriptures, and therefore the doctrine of these sermons amounts to a statement which even the Church of Rome never dared to make, for she maintains, although she corrupts them by various processes, the authority of the Old Testament Scriptures. Well, it seems to me that nothing more grave than that could possibly be put forth from any pulpit. When we think of such a comparison as that of the Old Testament to the rough draft of an old will which is now set aside, it seems to me that there is something appalling in the whole of the doctrine, and that the Church ought to look at it as one of the gravest things that has occurred, that such a doctrine should have been preached from a pulpit of the Free Church. (Hear.) The Presbytery of Glasgow were unanimous in condemning these doctrines—both the doctrine that the authority of the Old Testament had ceased, and the doctrine that the moral law, as contained in the Ten Commandments, had ceased to be binding. But when the next step came to be taken a difficulty arose. I for one cannot assent to the doctrine which I understood to have been stated from the bar, viz., that you put a man in a false position—a Christian man, a Christian minister—by asking him directly to disavow and withdraw, distinctly to withdraw, statements so utterly subversive of the whole principles of divine truth as this to which I have referred. If truly convinced he should be forward to do this of his own accord. I don't think it is enough that he should listen to your statement that his opinions are erroneous and inconsistent with the Word of God, and with the standards of the Church; nor do I reckon it sufficient that he should even make another declaration, which seems to be inconsistent with his former objectionable statement. It is absolutely necessary that he should face the statements against which you object, and that he should withdraw these statements, and express his regret that he had been so rash as to utter them. (Hear, and applause.) What do we do in our kirk-sessions in matters of discipline? Would we there be satisfied with the making of a statement in the hearing of the person who comes before us for discipline, and having his tacit acquiescence in the statement? Do we not insist that the person himself shall first confess his error or sin, and, secondly, confess his regret? Is not that essential to all intelligible discipline? The only statement made in answer to this is, that Mr Smith has done that in substance in his concluding statement, on which we had so many commentaries to-day. But I have two very strong reasons in my own mind for thinking that that statement is not a retraction of the kind upon which we as a Church ought to insist. Dr Rainy has admitted that the first of these statements is capable of two interpretations. He says, "I hold most firmly the immutability of all divine and moral law." Of course, everybody holds that. He goes on, "And that the Decalogue contains a divinely authenticated summary of the law." That is an ambiguous statement. The question is, Does it contain the divinely authenticated summary? Does it contain the divine law? That is the question; and I hold Mr Smith's statement upon

it is ambiguous, and therefore not satisfactory to that extent. But I hold that the second statement is also ambiguous—"That the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments are the Word of God, and the only rule of faith and manners; and further, that their organic relation is of such a nature that the Old Testament does not derive its authority from the New, but both have the same kind of authority," &c. The real question here is, Have they both the same degree of authority? They both come from God, and certainly both have thus the same kind of authority. But has the Old Testament been in the slightest degree superseded, or is its authority now independent of the New, and of precisely the same amount, is it of the same degree as well as kind, as the authority of the New Testament? That is another ambiguity, but what throws ambiguity over the whole statement is the concluding passage, viz.—"I therefore of course now, as always, unhesitatingly disclaim any opinion at variance with these truths." He thus sets forth that he is now making only the statement which he has always made. He thus virtually leaves it open to reiterate the statements which he was supposed to have retracted, and he has in point of fact reiterated them in a printed volume which has been before us to-day. The force of this had been endeavoured to be turned away, as if Mr Smith was such a simpleton as not to know what were the bearings of the publication of such a volume upon the case—as if he were so thoroughly innocent and guileless, and so little a man of the world, that he did not understand that the book amounted to a repetition of the offence, and in fact to a repetition of the offence in very aggravated circumstances, for there is of the nature of contumacy in it as well as a repetition of the offence. The question for the Assembly is, Since Mr Smith has done this, what confidence can you have in this alleged previous retractation, for here is the very thing published over again? And are we in this Assembly to send the matter away in these circumstances as if the case were concluded? Are we, the Assembly, by a series of propositions, which so far condemn him and his doctrines, but upon the whole constitute a whitewashing of him and at all events a sending of him away from our bar absolved, to leave him thus free to go and preach exactly as he likes on this whole matter in the future? Are we, on such a ground as this, to close up the case? I for one am not prepared for anything of the sort, and I am quite certain that if this Assembly attempts to close the case in such a way, they will expose themselves justly to the condemnation of multitudes of Christian people throughout the country who are looking on with intense interest on this case. It is not Mr Smith at the present moment that is on his trial. It is in reality the Assembly of this Church that is upon its trial. (Hear, and applause.) The question which the people of this country are asking in connexion with this case is, What kind of doctrines are to be preached hereafter from the pulpits of the Free Church? Is a minister to be permitted to preach these doctrines, and after a dubious explanation to go on repeating the offence by publication and repetition of these doctrines in a book; and are you simply to satisfy yourselves with a series of resolutions, and so dismiss the case? Will you not moreover thus censure your own Presbytery—whose fidelity in this case deserves the utmost honour of all Christian men—by sustaining a dissent and appeal against an attempt to get Mr Smith to retract those offensive statements which have struck alarm, I have no hesitation in saying, into the hearts

of all who are intelligent enough to see their extensive bearing upon the doctrines of the Church and the interests of religion in the country. Dr Rainy's motion not only sustains the dissent and complaint, but it actually reverses the judgment of the Presbytery—that is to say, it says that you must ask no retraction, even after Mr Smith has repeated the offence—openly repeated the offence in the presence of the whole population. (Hear, hear.) I am not prepared for anything of the sort; but, on the other hand, would respectfully move, “That the General Assembly dismiss the dissent and complaint, and remit to the Presbytery of Glasgow to proceed in the case according to the laws of the Church.” (Slight applause, and hear, hear.) I know that some will shrink from a renewal of the case, and I for one would have been delighted if it had been possible to dispose of it at this Assembly, but it has come up in a somewhat awkward form. I think the leniency—for I put it down to no other account—manifested by the Presbytery of Glasgow, in not proceeding to a libel when the explanations were found unsatisfactory, has placed us in somewhat of a difficulty. I would not like any sentence of this Court that would dispose of the case in the way of finally pronouncing judgment upon it, because I think as it goes on it must assume one of two forms—there must either be a clear and distinct explanation, retraction, and expression of regret, or there must be proceedings that will bring this case before us in another shape, and therefore I omit altogether reference to the judgment of the Presbytery of Glasgow for that reason alone; but I could never sanction any reversal of the judgment, and therefore confine myself simply to the dismissal of the dissent and complaint. The dissent and complaint interposes unnecessarily and improperly with the usual course of discipline, and I wish the Presbytery of Glasgow to be set free to decide this matter. If Mr Smith really retracts the views which he has expressed, let us understand that clearly and distinctly. (Hear, hear.) Why should we attempt to hush up this matter in the proposed form? (Applause.) Why, it reminds me far more of the proceedings of the old Moderate Assemblies than I should like anything in the proceedings of this Free Church. (Slight hisses.) It seems to me that we cannot allow the matter to be hushed up in this way with any regard to our duty in connexion with the question and the interests of truth. If our friends in Glasgow can bring it out clearly that Mr Smith, as is alleged, retracts the sentiments to which he has given utterance and will not repeat them, good and well; but do not let us shut our eyes to the actual fact that a case has come before us of the most aggravated heresy,—heresy repeated in the most offensive way—and that we, instead of proceeding to discipline in a gentle and Christian spirit, have satisfied ourselves with passing some general resolutions in this Assembly, and at the same time, and in the same breath, virtually pronouncing censure upon those men who have been labouring to defend the truth and to discharge their duty in the Presbytery of Glasgow. I beg, therefore, to move in the terms I have stated.

Dr M'GILVRAY said that on reading the papers connected with the case, he was led to the conclusion, with Dr Rainy, that Mr Smith did not see very distinctly the nature of the position which he was taking up, or the force of the objections to which that position was exposed. They all knew something of Mr Smith's literary tastes, and most of them knew a

little of his literary talents ; and to that cause, if he were not mistaken, might be ascribed the influence which had led Mr Smith into the error into which he had fallen. It was a common impression among the literary men of the South—an impression that had prevailed more or less since the days of the Puritans, and which Mr Buckle had produced in its most offensive form—that the people of Scotland especially were taught to ascribe more importance to the Old Testament than to the New. No doubt there were many things in the religious character of our people, and some things in the traditions of our Churches, which might serve to account so far for this impression ; but the cause which beyond all others had strengthened and confirmed it lay in the Fourth Commandment, and in the views our people hold as to the binding obligation of that sacred statute. The people of the South professed to receive that Commandment as we did ourselves. The Decalogue was part of their national creed, as it was of our own, but the difference between them and us in regard to that matter was, that whilst we believed it, and endeavoured to obey the commandment, so far as we could, they, on the other hand, sought to honour the Commandment by proclaiming it with great pomp in the ears of the people every Sabbath-day, and setting it up before their eyes on the walls of their churches, while they did not profess to believe it, and did not attempt to practise it. Now, he held the course pursued by us here in the North, however Judaical it might appear to the literary theologians of the South, including such high religious authors as Charles Dickens and Anthony Trollope—(laughter)—that course was more consistent with honesty, and with the principles of Christianity too, than the rule followed by our friends on the south of the Tweed—a rule according to which the Fourth Commandment was more honoured in the breach than in the observance. He was very far from saying that Mr Smith had any direct sympathy with this class of writers, but he thought Mr Smith had allowed himself to be led aside far too much by their ignorant outcries about the Judaical spirit of our Scottish theology. (Hear, hear.) He quite agreed with Dr Begg in thinking that there was a great deal of ambiguity in Mr Smith's final explanation, which would enable him to come out and occupy the broadest ground he had taken up in any part of those two discourses if he thought fit. Dr M'Gilvray concluded by seconding Dr Begg's motion.

Mr ADAM, Aberdeen, said they were all at one as to the teaching of these sermons. (Hear.) They were dealing with explanations of the teaching in them. If they were to hold the explanations as satisfactory, they ought to put their finding in such a form as not unduly to humiliate Mr Smith—(hear)—or to hurt his usefulness. Now, he thought there was something that pointed just a little in this direction in Dr Rainy's motion. He had also another difficulty—viz., that the motion was rather too long and complicated ; and he thought it might readily be simplified and modified in the way he had indicated, if they were not prepared to adopt the motion of Dr Begg finding the explanations unsatisfactory.

Mr BURNSIDE dealt upon the danger of having poison distributed instead of bread from any of the pulpits of the Church, and urged that the greater Mr Smith's abilities were, and the more influential his congregation, so much the greater was the danger of allowing the poison to be distributed. The Presbytery of Glasgow were unanimous in finding that Mr Smith's sermons were in direct antagonism to the Scriptures, and to

the standards of the Church, nor did even Dr Rainy deny this. The question before the House was, not how the poison in the sermons originated, but how Mr Smith could be prevented from any longer disseminating his dangerous doctrines, and the only effectual way for this was to remit the case to the Presbytery. He (Mr B.) supported Dr Begg's motion out and out.

Mr NIXON could not agree with either of the motions proposed. He would be extremely unwilling to send this case down again to the Presbytery of Glasgow; and he thought that if Dr Rainy's motion were adopted, even with the severe reflections it contains, it would not be a sufficient testimony on the part of the General Assembly against the deadly errors that are contained in these two sermons of Mr Smith. At all times, but especially at the present time, considering the lawlessness that prevailed, and the disposition that was so general to renounce all regard to laws human or divine, a more pernicious course could not be taken than that of unsettling men's minds as to the unchangeable obligation to do homage to the words spoken by God on Sinai. (Hear, hear.) The statements originally made by Mr Smith in his sermons, and the statement in his last explanation, are as antagonistic to each other as they are to the standards of the Church. He said this, while, as he was not a heresy-hunter, he would have been willing to accept the latter statement as not inconsistent with their standards. It is quite clear Mr Smith does not understand the plainest English if he does not see the opposition between his sermons and the last statement he has made. (Hear, hear.) And if he does not see the opposition in future, he will of course be teaching the doctrine of these two sermons again. A proof that this might be expected indeed was the publication of this volume of sermons, whereby he was practically flinging defiance at them. (Hear.) Yet Dr Rainy told them that though they might scold Mr Smith they were to assilzie him. Like all country ministers, he had a personal interest in this matter. Within a recent period, about half a dozen young men had gone from under his teaching to Glasgow, and the larger half of them have gone to that church. (Hear, hear.) But, said Mr Nixon, I shall take care that if I can help it, no more shall go there in future unless some security—(cheers and prolonged hisses from the direction of the students' gallery.)

Mr THOMSON, St Stephen's—(pointing to the upper west gallery)—There is a gallery up there in which persons are making that noise. It does not come from the students' gallery. (Continued hissing and cheers.)

Mr NIXON said what he would suggest for consideration was the desirableness of the appointment of a committee to have a personal interview with Mr Smith. He was anxious to deal with him in the most kindly, the most brotherly way; but he thought they must endeavour to obtain some kind of moral security that—even should he not himself see the deadly nature of these heresies on the ground that such is the mind of the Church—he will avoid that kind of teaching.

Sir HENRY MONCREIFF said he felt the solemnity of the considerations which Mr Nixon had been urging. He felt also the solemnity of other considerations which had been urged at the bar, but he felt likewise that the very solemn character of the matter with which they had to deal made it all the more indispensable that they should be extremely cautious as well as

extremely earnest in the course they took. The question was, How did this matter stand at present? Did it come up in a shape in which they could reasonably or hopefully deal with it in the way proposed by Dr Begg? He must say he felt himself constrained to state that, looking at the papers, it did not appear to him to come up in a shape in which they could reasonably and hopefully deal with it as Dr Begg would have them to do. (Hear, hear.) Were they prepared to say that it was in a shape in which they could lay the foundation of a libel? He knew how many men, who were in earnest about an important question connected with God's law and the interests of the Church, felt themselves drawn towards the course which would most speedily get quit of what appeared to them to be an evil, or, as it had been called, a poison; but there was need for the sober consideration of how they were placed, so as to deal with the matter. If there were poison, it must be watched most carefully, and they must see that in due time steps were taken to put an end to it; but that was a very different question from saying that they could reasonably, at the present juncture, in regard to this case, put themselves in the position in which they should proceed to frame a libel. They must remember that the worst thing they could possibly do would be to put themselves in the position of being obliged to frame a libel when they could not do it reasonably or hopefully. (Hear, hear.) Mr Nixon had admitted that there was a great and decided contrariety between Mr Smith's sermons and the last statement he had made. Mr Nixon admitted that the last statement could be accepted by him as sound, because he was not a heresy-hunter. He (Sir H. Moncreiff) was not a heresy-hunter, and he also regarded the statement as containing a declaration that was in accordance with the Word of God and the standards of the Church. (Hear, hear.) With regard to what had been said as to the expression, "both having the same kind of authority," he thought that was really a piece of unfair criticism on the part of Dr Begg, because the thing Mr Smith was accused of was just that he said they did not possess the same kind of authority, and so it was natural that he should, in making this declaration, say that he did hold that they had the same kind of authority. He was very far from saying that he was satisfied with all Mr Smith's statements. He did not agree with Mr Adam that Dr Rainy's motion proceeded upon the idea that they were satisfied with the statements. But look at the grave alternative Dr Rainy put. If it turned out that Mr Smith really did mean by that last statement to hold by what was sound in future, the matter was disposed of, and after the statements in the Assembly were brought to his notice, he might discontinue all such modes of expression as would give rise to such ideas again; but if not, then the matter would be in a better shape in the end for any serious proceedings being taken, which would land in the conclusion to which some of their friends are now pointing. In present circumstances, he thought it would be a very dangerous thing to agree to Dr Begg's proposal. With reference to Mr Nixon's suggestion, he did not think that it was even the most likely way to get at the object Mr Nixon proposed. It was quite clear that if what Mr Nixon dreaded should turn out to be true that they would soon hear something more of the case, it was plain that, if the fear was well founded, they would have it in another shape, and probably in a shape in which it would be easier to deal with, and in the way in which it ought to be dealt with.

But the fear might not be well founded ; Mr Smith might fulfil the expectations of some of his friends, and he was sure the members of Assembly would all be most thankful. He feared that the appointing of a committee would only be to make Mr Smith of too great importance in the view of the Church. (Hear, hear.) He did not deny the grave importance of any minister of this Church teaching what had been described as poison, yet, notwithstanding that, he thought such a mode of procedure as that proposed by Mr Nixon might do more harm than good. Therefore, he supported the motion of Dr Rainy. (Applause.)

Mr COWAN, Troon, asked what the position of the Presbytery of Glasgow would be—supposing they were called upon to frame a libel—when they had against them the names of Robert Buchanan, Patrick Fairbairn, and a host of others ?

Principal LUMSDEN was not sure that he would be able to vote for either motion. He admitted fully the force of the objections to sending the case back to the Presbytery. But he could not accord with the statement in Dr Rainy's motion, or the second of the reasons of dissent, that Mr Smith had disavowed the erroneous opinions alleged to be contained in his sermons. The last of Mr Smith's explanatory statements were, to say the least, of doubtful interpretation. The nature of the erroneous statements, which the Presbytery had unanimously censured, required, in the interests of truth, an unambiguous unmistakable disclaimer. Had the explanatory statement been a document, the author of which was dead or inaccessible, they behoved to satisfy themselves as to its correct interpretation in the same way in which they dealt with the work of a deceased writer ; but as Mr Smith was alive, it seemed the most rational course to adopt some such plan as was suggested by Mr Nixon, and confer with him on its meaning. This seemed due to Mr Smith himself—for whom no one cherished any other feeling than that of affection—in order that if Dr Rainy's interpretation of his words be correct, he might be cleared of all suspicion of holding opinions which all of them regarded as unscriptural. Much had been made in the pleadings from the bar of the fact that Mr Smith had acquiesced in the censure which a unanimous Presbytery had pronounced on his sermons. It was a significant commentary on the acquiescence supposed to be implied in silence, and a circumstance fitted to increase doubt as to the correctness of the assumption stated in Dr Rainy's motion, that Mr Smith had been subsequently guilty of what could not be spoken of as other than the outrage of publishing and circulating the very sermons, without any alteration of the statements which the Presbytery had censured. Mr Smith's book being acknowledged, and, he might say, on the table, he thought it would be cowardly to avoid making reference in their deliverance to the book published by Mr Smith.

Dr CANDLISH—I will not detain the House more than a few minutes. Above all things, I hope and trust that this General Assembly will not entertain the proposal made by Mr Nixon, and which seems to be indicated by Principal Lumsden. I say this with the utmost possible feeling of the desirableness of getting Mr Smith to be of the same mind with us thoroughly and avowedly, and with the utmost feeling of the importance of this Church doing something decided in the way of arresting progress in this error. I give this reason—over and above that stated by Sir Henry Moncreiff of its magnifying the man too much—that it would involve

the General Assembly in a responsibility in which no General Assembly of this Church, except in the last extremity, ought to place itself. For if we should appoint a committee to deal with Mr Smith, and should get him to explain what he means—where are we? If we succeed, it will seem to me a sort of miracle. Mr Smith, as we all know, is a man who rejoices in notoriety—a man who, as we all know, would take it as a high compliment to have a committee of the Assembly appointed to confer with him—(laughter)—and as a still higher ground of praise to set that committee at defiance. I believe that; and I go on to say, on the other hand, that by far the best hope of influencing Mr Smith's mind—by far the best hope of reaching Mr Smith's heart is—that he should be told affectionately and yet faithfully what is the unanimous mind of this General Assembly—that the sentence of the Assembly, as proposed in Dr Rainy's motion, should be left to tell upon Mr Smith, not during the exciting days of the Assembly's sittings, and with the view of another field-day afterwards, on the report coming up; but it should be left to tell on Mr Smith's mind and heart calmly when he has time to weigh it, in his closet and on his knees. I am of opinion he should be left calmly, quietly, and at his leisure, to weigh the import of the sentence, and to weigh the import of the sentence passed under the circumstances in which we are now placed by the unanimous vote of this Church, for Dr Begg's motion is a confirmation of the censure which we propose. But should we appoint a committee to deal with Mr Smith, and they are not satisfied with his explanations, what are we to do? Either you must libel him yourselves, or appoint a committee to libel him, or you must enjoin the Presbytery of Glasgow to libel him. Now, Sir, I think these arguments are sufficient to weigh against the proposal of Mr Nixon. I do not think it needful to argue at length on Dr Begg's motion. It is doubtful whether this Court can require any man to retract before he has been libelled in the ordinary way, by citing chapter and verse, and giving him the ordinary facilities for explanation and evidence. I admit the right of any Court of this Church to deal with him and advise him to retract, but I doubt very much whether the resolution of the Presbytery of Glasgow does not go a little beyond that, and does not go a step beyond what the Presbytery was entitled to take.

Dr BEGG—Dr Candlish is under the impression that my motion affirms the sentence of the Presbytery; but it does not do so. My motion simply dismisses the dissent and complaint, and remits the matter to the Presbytery, to proceed according to the laws of the Church. It says nothing whatever of insisting upon the retraction.

Dr CANDLISH—But if you do not sustain the dissent and complaint, it is plain you remit to the Presbytery to proceed to such further action as may seem to them necessary or expedient, in terms of the sentence they have passed. (“Hear, hear,” and “No, no.”)

Dr BEGG—Quite so; but under the new circumstances.

Dr CANDLISH—You no doubt remit the case to the Presbytery to proceed according to the laws of the Church, but upon the sentence already passed.

Dr BEGG—Not necessarily; the Presbytery take the new circumstances into consideration. (Hear, hear, and cries of “The Book.”)

Dr CANDLISH—The sentence stands, if you dismiss the dissent and complaint; but I really do not mean to stand on that point. I was

merely making a remark or two on the sentence of the Presbytery, to show that to my mind it goes a little farther than the Presbytery were entitled to go without proceeding by libel. Suppose a sermon or a proposition of mine were sent forth upon a theological subject. You are not entitled to come and ask me to retract a sentence which you may think heretical, but which I may think quite consistent with the other parts of that sermon. You are not entitled to ask me to retract; you are bound to libel me, to show by chapter and verse from the Scriptures what is wrong about the passage you condemn, and then, after that, you may require me to retract, on pain of the highest censure of the Church, but not till then. But I am very strongly of opinion that the object at which Mr Nixon so properly aimed, and which he so emphatically and earnestly and ably impressed upon us, is most thoroughly gained this night in this General Assembly and in the Church—(applause)—far more thoroughly than it could have been gained by any merely formal procedure in this case of Mr Smith. It was said from the bar that if we sustained the dissent and complaint, and reversed the judgment of the Presbytery, we would send Mr Smith abroad to teach the same things that he had been teaching before. That may be true, but we send him abroad on his ministry warned—well warned—warned by the whole Presbytery of which he is a member—warned by this General Assembly—that our eyes will be on him, that our ears will be open. We charge him on his allegiance not to repeat this offence. We charge him, as a dutiful son of the Church, to beware of preaching such things henceforth. We send him abroad under a prohibition—under an express prohibition—to teach these no more anywhere in this Church; and if it should be found that, in spite of that warning, and in spite of the prohibition, he or any other minister of this Church shall be propagating similar views, we have a stronger hold on them than we have at the present moment against Mr Smith; and we give it forth emphatically before this country, before Christendom and the whole world—we give forth the unanimous, united, cordial, warmest adherence of this Church, as represented in this General Assembly, to the old, sound Calvinistic, orthodox doctrine as to the moral law and the Old Testament Scriptures. (Loud applause.)

Dr Wood, Dumfries, said it occurred to him that what Dr Rainy proposed to the Assembly was an extraordinary and unprecedented thing. When had it ever happened that the General Assembly finally adjudicated upon a case without having the parties before them, and hearing what they had to say for themselves? The Assembly was about to adjudicate finally on this case of Mr Smith, and they were about to pass a serious sentence upon him, and they had not heard one word from himself in reference to the charges against him. They had heard from all sides various statements regarding his sentiments, and his explanations of them, but would it not have been just to Mr Smith, and in accordance with their usual practice, to hear what he had to say for himself? If they adopted Dr Rainy's motion they would be adjudicating without having heard Mr Smith; if they adopted Dr Begg's motion they would give him an opportunity of speaking before the Court that was to take up his case and adjudicate upon it. The case was a serious one. If it had been the case of an individual it would not have been so serious a matter; but the doctrines were the doctrines of a school, and did not originate with the individual. He did not say it was a school that had any members

in the Free Church, but it was a school that exists in the country outside the Free Church, and he thought it belonged to that venerable Assembly, as the guardian of the interests of the Church, to see that no member of such a school found an entrance into the Free Church, or if he did find an entrance, that he be made to cease from teaching the doctrines of that school. Dr Wood concluded by saying, if they did not give Mr Smith an opportunity of being heard, it would not be just to the Assembly, nor to Mr Smith.

Dr RAINY said he would not detain the House by any formal reply ; but in answer to the remarks of Dr Wood, he might observe that the reference brings up all the parties. Mr Smith had full opportunity of sisting himself if he had chosen. He knew this, and it was intimated from the bar that he was ready to come up there if called, although he exercised his own judgment, and, in his present state of health, he chose to stay away. He did so, no doubt, in the belief that full materials were before the Assembly in the statements upon record, and if Mr Smith was content, they had no occasion, in his interests, to be discontented. (Hear.) With regard to the book, the Assembly knew nothing of it, except the fact of its publication. They were not entitled to say that it contained the sermons "without a word of explanation." They did not know that. The safe ground for the Assembly to stand upon was to say that, on the strength of his explanation, and believing it to be an honest one, we send you back, but you are bound not to repeat teaching of the quality we have found this to be ; and if Mr Smith does not comply with that injunction, he takes the consequences. The vote was then taken, with the following result :—

For Dr Rainy's motion,	.	.	301
For Dr Begg's amendment,	.	.	111
			<hr/>
Majority for the motion,	.	.	190

The result was received with some applause by the audience.

Dr BEGG dissented in his own name, and in the name of those who might adhere to him.

The Assembly then adjourned at twenty-five minutes past one in the morning, to meet again at eleven o'clock.

WEDNESDAY, MAY 29.

DEPUTATION OF IRISH PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH.

There was laid before the Assembly an extract minute from the records of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland, from which it appeared that at their last meeting they had received the deputation from this Church, and heard their addresses with much satisfaction ; that they rejoiced in the continued prosperity of this Church, and in the prospect of union among Presbyterians in Scotland ; and that they had instructed the deputation to convey the expression of their warm and fraternal feelings.

Another extract minute was read from the same records, from which it appeared that the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland had appointed the Rev. Henry Wallace of Londonderry, and the Rev. James Gibson of Strathbane, with Hugh Simpson, George M'Carter, and Thomas Sinclair, junior, esquires, ruling elders, a deputation to this Assembly.

The deputation was then introduced by Dr Hugh Miller, one of the deputation last year from this Assembly to the Assembly in Ireland. Mr Wallace, Mr Gibson, and Mr Simpson being present, addressed the Assembly in succession.

MR WALLACE first addressed the Assembly. After some introductory remarks, he spoke of the Presbyterian Church as a witness for the truth in the midst of the speculative activity and the aberration of activity which prevailed at the present day. We were easily taken with some startling novelty, whether in science or theology. We loved anything very sensational, and not only in literature but in theology was there a tendency to the sensational which the Church had need to watch. He believed very great vigilance was manifested by the Presbyterian Church in watching the tendency of the times, and he was sure no man could have read or heard the debate of yesterday without feeling that there was as much activity on the side of truth as against it—that there were men as capable of standing up to maintain the truth of God as there were men of science and literature active to assail it. (Applause.) This was hopeful, and he thought the debate would serve an admirable purpose. It came most opportunely in the present day—most opportunely for Britain and for Ireland, although Ireland was slower to partake of the speculative activity which reigned more in England and in Scotland. But still that literature and theology was coming amongst the Irish, and he thanked God for the debate of yesterday, for it would show that there was a power in the Presbyterian Church to stand up as a witness for the truth of God, and to deal with error when it appeared. Without taking upon him to say anything upon either side, it was manifest that, however the debate might have issued, there was a power to deal rationally, reasonably, and argumentatively with error, and to deal with it as a matter of discipline—a power which belonged to the Presbyterian Church alone, for there was no other Church capable of taking up the same position and of carrying it out. There was great need to watch for the purity of divine worship. He should have supposed that Scotland was the last place in the world where there was any need to testify this, but there was a movement going on in Scotland which had proceeded further than he thought. He had observed a goodly six shilling volume lying on the booksellers' tables, manifestly with the view of introducing liturgical worship into the Church of Scotland. He thought that if they looked into the Word of God it was perfectly evident that it was the purpose of God that the exercises of His house should be carried on by the free exercise of those gifts which He has bestowed upon His people. And if the worship of God was to be maintained in its purity they required very jealously to guard the form of it, and he believed that our forms were capable of cultivation even by natural powers and by the Spirit of God; and, he said, our protection against danger lay in these elements. It was sometimes complained that Presbyterians were a little too narrow and needed comprehensiveness; and

they had seen some doctrines about comprehension in these latter days that would be comprehension enough to annihilate the Church. When they were told in a very high-standing literary periodical, by a young nobleman, that the Church ought to be able to comprehend within its communion and ministry such a man as Theodore Parker—when they had such a comprehension as that—there was no longer any use of making a distinction between the Church and the world. They were not comprehensive enough to embrace the world within the Church, but he maintained they were comprehensive enough to embrace the whole Church of God, and to embrace all that held the truth of God, and to embrace all upon whom the Spirit of God rests. They had need to be watchful, and he thanked God that he had had the opportunity of seeing the vigilance of the Free Church on these great matters. (Applause.)

Mr GIBSON followed, and commented on the various speculative tendencies of the age. Adverting to the position of the Church of England, he observed that, when we exchanged the sphere of the world for that of the Church, we expected to enter the shrine of peaceful meditations, of accordant doctrines, and of harmonious working, for is not the truth one? And yet we seemed to enter a school of doubt rather than of faith, and instead of a house at peace with itself, we behold an arena of contending factions. On the one hand, the Church seemed hopelessly immersed in the inundation of the melted snows of German infidelity; on another side, she was decking herself with idiot pride in the trappings of mediæval symbolism that are being laughed and hooted out of Italy. And her consecrated heads, when appealed to by the bleeding body of Christ, lift up their hands in the helplessness of children, and re-echo the wail of him in the Vatican—*Non possumus*. Amidst all the errors of the day, however, it was cheering to know that the system of doctrine and polity to which the Presbyterians adhere maintains its efficiency and superiority on the side of truth.

Mr M^CCORKLE, in connexion with the members of the deputation of the Irish Presbyterian Church who had just spoken, referred to the high theological qualifications of the students and ministers of the Church; to their soundness in doctrine, to their strong attachment to the Presbyterian discipline and worship, and their missionary zeal as a Church. In touching on the question of the *Regium Donum*, he said, to describe the reception of it as an adulterous connexion with the State was surely very exaggerated language. As having been for seven years a minister in Limerick, he had never had any difficulty in accepting the *Regium Donum*. He moved that the following deliverance:—"The General Assembly hereby record their satisfaction with the addresses of the Deputation, and instruct the Moderator to convey to them the cordial thanks of the House. The Assembly also renew the expression of their strong sympathy with the operations of the Presbyterian Church of Ireland for the furtherance of Christ's kingdom, and of their fervent prayer that the faithful Presbyterians of Ireland and the faithful Presbyterians of Scotland may be more and more closely united by the ties of faith and love, in the endeavour, by God's grace, to uphold the Saviour's honour, and to advance His cause, according to the Scriptures."

Dr RAINY seconded. He said the Free Church had never forgotten, and never could forget, that their Irish Presbyterian friends stood by them in their struggle, when, if they had been willing to forsake them,

they might readily have found a plausible excuse for doing so. (Hear, hear.) At that time the Irish Presbyterian Church had rendered a most grateful testimony, and given a most grateful sympathy. Therefore, while they gave a cordial welcome to Presbyterian deputations from any quarter, it was with peculiar satisfaction and sympathy they welcomed a deputation from the Irish Presbyterian Church. (Applause.)

The motion was unanimously approved of.

The MODERATOR, addressing the deputation, said—After the pleasant and profitable intercourse which has so long been maintained between your Church and ours, it is not needful that I should assure you that the visit of the Irish deputation is always a welcome occasion in our General Assemblies. It would be strange and unnatural, indeed, if we could regard your Church, and whatever concerns it, with other than feelings of almost parental interest. For, sprung from ourselves, your ecclesiastical history has been closely connected with our own. You have had similar struggles for truth and freedom. And, embracing more than a half of the Protestant population of Ireland, you stand fast this day in the enjoyment of the spiritual liberty and independence, to secure which the Free Church of Scotland has endured so many costly sacrifices. (Hear, hear.) Moreover, as has been already said by my friend Dr Rainy, we can never forget your sympathy with us during our ten years' conflict, and how all your influence, corporate and personal, was employed to persuade the Government of the country to recognise our scriptural and constitutional rights and claims. Nor can we forget how, when our united efforts in this direction had all proved unavailing, you effectually helped us by the presence and services of many of your best and ablest ministers, amidst the early difficulties of Disruption times. (Applause.) Our interest in your Church, and in her wise and zealous efforts to promote the religious and social well-being of your country, is further deepened by the love we bear to Ireland, by our desire for the happiness of her susceptible, imaginative, and warm-hearted people, and because we look to your Church as a means, in the hand of God, of her deliverance from the ignorance and error and superstition by which she is enthralled, and from the party and political animosities by which her peace is so often disturbed and her prosperity retarded. It is our heart's desire and prayer that the members of our Free Church, and the people of Scotland generally, may ever be found ready to encourage your labours, directed to these Christian and patriotic ends, by their cordial sympathy and liberal aid. And may the great Head of the Church Himself bless with ever-increasing success your invaluable Home Mission. We pray that many souls may be gathered to Himself by its instrumentality; at the same time, mindful that godliness is profitable for all things, and has the promise of this life as well as of the life to come, we entreat that you may be honoured to do for all Ireland what you have been honoured to do for the province of Ulster; that so loyalty and order, tranquillity and industry, may distinguish the character of your entire population, and that the Three Kingdoms, united in the bonds of truth and love, may form "a threefold cord, not quickly broken." (Applause.)

The Assembly then appointed as their deputation to the Presbyterian Church in Ireland, Dr Lorimer, Glasgow; Mr Patrick T. Muirhead, Kippen; and Mr T. S. Anderson, Crailing; with Mr George Harvey, Mr Thomas Chalmers, and Mr John M. McCandlish, ruling elders.

SUSTENTATION FUND—SPECIAL REPORTS.

Dr BUCHANAN—I have now to lay on the table four special reports. First, a report which has reference to charges contributing to the Sustentation Fund at and under £50 per annum ; next, a report respecting congregations that have passed through the hands of the committee during the last ten years for the moderation of calls, with the object of bringing out how far these congregations have kept faith, so to speak, with the committee—that is to say, have really contributed to the Sustentation Fund the amount that was arranged with the congregation at the beginning of the incumbency which brought them before the committee. Then there is a report on the subject of supplements to ministers. I think it desirable, however, not to enter upon the subjects of these three separate reports until the Assembly has taken up and disposed of one that is more urgent and more important in its own nature than any one of the three—I refer to the special report of the Sustentation Committee, which has regard to the Sustentation Fund itself. I have no doubt that this report—of which I hold a copy in my hand, and which has been in the hands of members—has been engaging their attention. I may simply mention that the meeting of the committee, at which it was adopted, was specially called for the purpose ; and it was held after a previous meeting, at which the subject had been under pretty full consideration. The whole subject was considered so important, that this subsequent special meeting of the committee was held for the purpose of going into this report and the proposals which it contains. That meeting was attended by fifty-four members, who were unanimous on the subject of the report. It may therefore be fairly said to come before the House with some claim to attention and consideration.

It will be necessary for me to go into the nature of these proposals at some length, and it is to this task I now propose to give myself, with the indulgence of the General Assembly. I hope I may be pardoned for asking, at the outset, the earnest attention of the House to what I am about to say. The proposal which I have undertaken to submit to the Assembly may have its faults and imperfections, but for the object at which it aims I feel that I am entitled to claim the most thoughtful consideration. The importance of that object it is hardly possible to overestimate. “Like priest, like people,” is an old and true proverb, and one which is full of meaning. An inferior ministry will soon, and inevitably, create its own counterpart in the moral and religious inferiority of those who are placed under it ; and what else but an inferior ministry can any people have, who, whether from thoughtlessness or selfishness, withhold the means of adequately maintaining it? Wealth, it is true, has its dangers for ministers of religion as for all other men. Had these dangers not been both real and great, the awfully significant saying of our Lord would never have been uttered—“It is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of heaven.” But poverty has its dangers too, and these not less formidable than the other. The wisest of men saw this clearly, not only when he sought to be himself exempted from the temptations peculiar to both extremes, but when he said so emphatically, “The destruction of the poor is their poverty.” By the meanness, the discontent, the

envy, the impatience which poverty has so powerful a tendency to breed, it, for the most part, fatally counterworks all better influences, and eats all true nobleness out of the soul. And who does not know that the poverty which is so perilous is a relative term? Poverty may be not a whit less pinching or less oppressive though it wears no rags, and does not beg in the streets. The kind of it, indeed, which is the hardest to bear is that which utters no complaint, and hides itself beneath the semblance of needing nothing. I believe there is poverty of this silently suffering kind in many a Free Church manse, and in the homes of many ministers in almost every branch of the Christian Church. Yes! little do those whose cup is full and running over—who have all and abound—know or consider the straits in the midst of which many a minister's family, in the very church to which they themselves belong, are passing their careworn lives. When the head of such a straitened family hardly knows how the children that are growing up around him are to be fed and clothed, and still less how they are to be suitably educated and sent out into the world; or how, in struggling to acquit himself of these parental responsibilities, he is to get the two ends of his income and of his pecuniary obligations to meet; how can it be that, under the weight of such incessant and depressing anxieties, his mind should be in good case for either his pulpit or his pastoral work!

There may be, and no doubt there are, individual men, whom God enables by His graces and gifts, not only to bear up under such harassing circumstances, but, in spite of them, to make full proof of their ministry, so that, as in the case of the Apostle Paul, their very trials and sufferings contribute to the furtherance of the gospel. But such cases are the exceptions only, and not the rule. In a poor church, and in troublous times like those of the gospel age, it might be warrantable to ask and to expect such things. But in a church, and in times like ours—dwelling in our ceiled houses, and sitting every man under his vine and under his fig-tree—to look for such things is simply to expect God to connive at our selfish unwillingness to do our duty. There are laws in the moral universe which cause men's sins to find them out, and their iniquities to correct them, as fixed and certain in their working as the laws of material nature itself. The great Head of the Church has said, "Let him that is taught in the Word communicate to him that teacheth in all good things." He has said, "The labourer"—the labourer that is in the spiritual vineyard of the Church—"is worthy of his hire." He has not only said, but "ordained that they who preach the gospel should live of the gospel." If these explicit commands of His be either altogether disregarded or but grudgingly or sparingly fulfilled, it will be found in the long run that this neglect of duty will bring down its own punishment. That which is so little appreciated will, by and by, so degenerate as to become really little worth. The starving of the ministry will gradually bring on a spiritual dearth, the souls of the people will be poorly fed, and there will be a famine, in the end, of the bread of life.

And here, Moderator, let me express the earnest hope that I may not be misunderstood in speaking as I have now done. Both the reason and the necessity for so speaking will sufficiently appear before I close. But, meanwhile, let it not be for a moment supposed that I am meaning to cast any special reflection, or to bring any special charge, against the

people of the Free Church, as if they had peculiarly failed in the great duty to which my observations have referred. Far from me be both the folly and the ingratitude which the making of so undeserved an imputation would involve. On the contrary, I, in my conscience, firmly believe, and am prepared, anywhere, confidently to affirm, that since those primeval times, when, in the first freshness and fulness of their love to the Lord that bought them, "they that believed were together, and had all things common, and sold their possessions and goods, and parted them to all men as every man had need," there never has been a nobler outburst of joyful, self-denying, large-hearted, loving liberality to God's cause than was exhibited by this Church of ours in the ever-memorable 1843. Oh! it was a blessed time; truly a time of refreshing from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of His power. Would that the windows of heaven were again opened, and that we were again baptized in that cloud and in that sea! Though nearly the quarter of a century has passed away since that marvellous time, who that had any part in it can look back upon it, even now, without feeling as if no other words could adequately describe it but those of the 68th Psalm:—"O God, when thou wentest forth before thy people, when thou didst march through the wilderness, the earth shook, the heavens also dropped at the presence of God: even Sinai itself was moved at the presence of God, the God of Israel. Thou, O God, didst send a plenteous rain, whereby thou didst confirm thine inheritance, when it was weary. Thy congregation hath dwelt therein: thou, O God, hast prepared of thy goodness for the poor. The Lord gave the word; great was the company of them that published it." Never can we be sufficiently thankful for the blessing we then received, and which, through us, was more or less shared in by many other churches both at home and abroad. Its results among ourselves it will tax the powers of some future Church historian to sum up and to describe:—Nearly a thousand churches built, and almost as many manses and schools; nearly a thousand congregations formed, and as many ministers and missionaries sustained all over the length and breadth of the land;—in a word, the whole equipment of a Christian Church set up and provided for, with its theological halls for the training of candidates for the ministry, its missions to the heathen and to the Jew, and to our own expatriated countrymen in every quarter of the world. In view of all this, not we ourselves only, but onlookers outside of us, have been constrained to say—What hath God wrought!

But while I most gladly bear this testimony to what Christian liberality, in this Church of ours, has achieved, is there not too much cause to fear that we have been falling away from our first love and from our first works? We have not, now, churches, or manses, or schools, or colleges to build, on anything approaching to the scale of Disruption times. And yet, with demands so much lessened and resources so largely set free, how little advance has been made in the amount of our mission and education funds, and especially of that great fund of which it is my more special province and purpose at this time to speak. Four-and-twenty years ago we set out with the resolution to provide, from that Central Fund, a minimum stipend for all our ministers of £150. To this hour that purpose remains unaccomplished. What I have come before you this day, by God's help to do, is to arrest the attention of this

House, and of this whole Church, on that discreditable fact. In 1843, with the great and heart-stirring sight before us of 500 ministers voluntarily surrendering their earthly all in order to uphold the spiritual rights and liberties of their people, and the crown rights of Zion's King, we solemnly and deliberately gave it out that, at least to the extent I have specified, we would make up what they had thus sacrificed, for Christ's and for conscience' sake. Almost a whole generation has passed away, and that pledge is still unredeemed. It is true we have now several hundreds of more ministers to maintain than we had at the beginning of our career as a disestablished Church; but it is also true that we have now much more wealth and many more people. If, for example, in the Presbytery of Glasgow, to which I belong, we had only thirty-two ministers to support at the date of the Assembly of 1844, whereas, at the date of the Assembly of 1866, we had fifty-nine ministers; let it be also borne in mind that, while at the former period the annual contributions of that Presbytery to the Sustentation Fund amounted to only £7161, they amounted, at the latter period, to £14,942. In reality, therefore, we have been doing little more than keeping up to the old original rate of giving to this great central fund of our Church. Certain it is, that instead of reaching at once the goal we had set before us, we have not fully reached it even after the lapse of four-and-twenty years. And what I want to get this Assembly and the Church at large to look at is, the obvious and undeniable fact that we cannot, either creditably or safely, do as we have been doing. If we do, we may shut our eyes to the consequences if we please, but that will not hinder these consequences from surely and steadily developing themselves, and in a form most disastrous to our Church and to religion in this land.

The value, scanty and limited as it was, considered as the means of supporting a minister and his family, which £150 represented in 1843, is not represented by it in 1867. The object, accordingly, of the first resolution embodied in the proposal which I have laid on the table of the Assembly, is to get the House to affirm this proposition—that the sum in question “is no longer sufficient for the purpose contemplated,” and that “the time has fully come for making a fresh appeal” on the subject to the congregations of the Church. It is not, however, with a mere negative declaration that I mean to content myself. What I further ask the House to commit itself to is the affirmation of the positive statement contained in the following words:—“That having respect to the greatly increased cost of living, to the immense additions that have been made to the wealth of the country, and to the extensive rise in the remuneration of service in all other departments of human labour which have taken place since 1843, the minimum stipend for her ministers at which the Church should now aim ought not to be less than £200.” From the words now quoted, it will be seen that the broad ground on which I ask the Assembly, and the whole Church, to embark in this movement is substantially this—that the sum of £150, fixed on as the minimum stipend for our ministers in 1843, even had it been sufficient then, has ceased to be sufficient now.

Every one indeed knows that in naming, at the date of the Disruption, so small a sum for the income of the great body of our ministers, it was our poverty and not our will that consented to it. With so much to do, and to

do all at once, in meeting the great emergency that had arisen, we did not feel that we could venture at that period to name any higher amount; and to their unspeakable honour, even the country ministers, who had given up the larger parochial benefices, cheerfully acquiesced in that truly modest and stinted provision. But though we had a reasonable excuse for acting as we did twenty-four years ago, we shall be altogether inexcusable if, at the present day, we allow that state of things to continue. In the first place, we are now, as a Church, far more favourably situated for making an effort to provide a more adequate stipend for our ministers than at the time of the Disruption. Other demands on our pecuniary resources are not nearly so great and pressing now as they were then. In the next place, the value of money has very considerably fallen, and therefore the necessity for making such an effort is more urgent than ever, if our ministers are not to be left for the future in a still worse position, as to their temporal support, than that in which they have hitherto stood. A hundred and fifty pounds, as every housekeeper well knows, will not go nearly as far in meeting the wants of a family in 1867 as it did in 1843. The truth of this statement is too obvious and undeniable, to need that either evidence or argument should be adduced in confirmation of it. But this is not all. There is another fact mentioned in the resolution to which I am now calling the attention of the Assembly, which has a most important bearing on this proposed movement, and to which we must take special care not to shut our eyes, if we really mean either to do justice to the claims of the Christian ministry, or to avert from our Church the greatest of all the calamities that could befall her—the want of an adequate supply of fitting men to occupy her pulpits, and to take the spiritual oversight of her people. I refer to the statement the resolution makes as to “the extensive rise in the remuneration of service in all other departments of human labour which has taken place since 1843.” During the long interval which has elapsed since that year, the remuneration of the great body of our ministers has been standing still. As already mentioned, it has not even yet reached that low point with which we proposed to begin a quarter of a century ago.

If, indeed, all other kinds of employment had been in the same position—if the various occupations in which the members of the Church themselves are engaged, had been passing through the very same sort of experience;—if the common labourer, if the skilled artisan, if those employed in the multifarious branches of trade and commerce, if men engaged in the secular professions, were now, in 1867, getting just the wages, or receiving just the salaries, or making just the gains of 1843, the argument I am about to use would have little or no force. In that case the ministry would be simply sharing in a state of things common to all other classes and to all other pursuits. But what I am prepared not merely to assert, but to demonstrate, is that the state of things now spoken of exists in the case of the ministry alone. For the ministry—in our own Church, and in unendowed Churches generally, nay, to a considerable extent even in the Established Churches themselves—remuneration has been left to stand at the old low level, while in all other departments of service, with scarcely a single exception, it has been steadily and largely on the rise. The fact now stated is, in fact, so notorious, that I do not believe there is a member of this House,

or a man of ordinary intelligence anywhere, who would think of calling it in question. At the same time, I am fully persuaded that, though in a vague and general way, its truth will be admitted by every one, there are comparatively few who are aware of the extent and the universality of its truth; and that there are fewer far who have ever thoughtfully and seriously looked at the fact itself, in its bearing on the great duty to which I am so earnestly desirous to stir up this Assembly and this Church. The statistics on this subject, which I am now about to present, might have been multiplied to almost any extent. To have increased their number, however, would only have been to encroach needlessly on the time and patience of the House. Those to which I now ask the attention of the Assembly have been carefully prepared, and are thoroughly reliable. I have arranged them under the following heads, viz. :—1. Wages of common and agricultural labour; 2. Wages of skilled labour; 3. Salaries and other emoluments of persons employed in various departments of trade and commerce, and in other similar pursuits.

I.—WAGES OF COMMON AND AGRICULTURAL LABOUR PER DAY IN DIFFERENT COUNTIES.

1. *Common Labour.*

	<i>s.</i>	<i>d.</i>		<i>s.</i>	<i>d.</i>
1856. Men, .	2	0	1846. Men, .	1	8
Women, .	0	10	Women, .	0	8
1866. Men, .	3	0	1866. Men, .	2	4
Women, .	1	2	Women, .	1	0

2. *Agricultural Labour.*

The rise in ploughmen's wages between 1846 and 1866 equals 20 per cent. and upwards.

II.—WAGES OF SKILLED LABOUR IN GLASGOW PER WEEK.

	1846.	1856.	1866.
	<i>s.</i> <i>d.</i>	<i>s.</i> <i>d.</i>	<i>s.</i> <i>d.</i>
Masons, .	22 6	25 0	32 6
Labourers, .	15 0	16 0	20 0
Bricklayers, .	24 0	27 0	33 0
Plasterers, .	22 0	26 0	30 0
Painters, .	17 0	22 6	26 0
Glaziers, .	18 0	22 0	26 0
Slaters, .	18 0	23 0	27 0
Plumbers, .	20 0	22 0	26 0
Blacksmiths, .	18 0	23 0	26 0

174 6

246 6 being an average rise of 41 per cent.

IN DUNDEE.

	1846.	1856.	1866.
	<i>s.</i> <i>d.</i>	<i>s.</i> <i>d.</i>	<i>s.</i> <i>d.</i>
Masons,	20 0	22 0	30 0
Joiners,	18 0	20 0	23 0
Tinsmiths,	17 0	18 0	23 0
Plumbers,	20 0	22 0	27 0
Mill Foremen,	20 0	21 0	26 0
Spinners, (young women),	7 0	8 6	12 0
Power-loom weavers (do),	7 0	8 9	13 0

109 0

154 0 being an average rise of 43 p. cent.

III.—SALARIES OF EMPLOYÉS IN TRADE AND COMMERCE, ETC.

The following are examples taken from large establishments in different commercial towns :—

Average Salaries of Heads of Departments in certain Commercial Houses.

	1846.	1856.	1866.
No. 1.	£100	£136	£200 equal to a rise of 100 per cent.
No. 2. {	200	250	350
	120	170	250
	130	200	250
	—		—
No. 3. {	450		850 equal to an average rise of 88 p. ct.
	100	12	200
	80	100	150
	60	70	120
	—		—
No. 4.	240		470 equal to an average rise of 95 p. ct.
No. 5.	119	179	301 equal to a rise of 152 per cent.
	100	150	250 equal to a rise of 150 per cent.

As regards the increase of the country's wealth generally, it may be sufficient to state one fact, that whereas the amount of assessable income, from property or otherwise, for the Property and Income-Tax in Scotland in 1842, was twenty-one millions, it is now thirty-nine millions, having thus nearly doubled since the period of the Disruption.

With the facts before us which these statistics so conclusively establish, there are surely some very grave questions which we ought to be putting to ourselves. There are questions such as these :—If all kinds of secular labour are receiving a constantly and largely increasing remuneration, is it either right or safe that the spiritual labour of the Christian ministry should be left to stand out as the solitary and glaring exception to this otherwise universal rule? Can we reasonably anticipate that, under such a state of things, we shall continue to obtain the requisite supply of the kind of men the Church more than ever needs for the doing of her sacred and all-important work? Can we expect any Church that sows so sparingly of its own carnal things, to reap otherwise than sparingly of God's spiritual things? Truly the children of this world are wiser in their generation than the children of light. They do not grudge the outlay which they know to be necessary to the success of their worldly undertakings. They are thoroughly alive to the fact, that if they are to have men of the requisite skill and character to do their work, they must meet the conditions in the shape of remuneration, on which, in the long-run, all such arrangements proceed.

In assuming, as I now do, in taking up this line of argument, that the principle, so universally acknowledged and acted on, in all secular affairs, has a direct and legitimate application to service in the Christian Church, am I thereby secularising the Christian ministry? If so, an inspired apostle has done it before me. For who does not know that, in the 1st Epistle to the Corinthians, a whole chapter is expressly devoted to this very object, of proving and proclaiming and pressing home on the conscience and the conviction of the members of the Christian Church, the substantial identity of the principle which regulates the remuneration of secular labour, with the principle which ought to regulate the remuneration of the spiritual service of the gospel ministry. Paul, in that chapter, singles out the soldier, the husbandman, the shepherd; and after speaking of the sustenance they receive as a right so obviously reasonable

and just as to need not even a word to be said in its support, he transfers the whole argument at once from the field of the world to the field of the Church, and he applies it thus :—"Do ye not know that they which minister about holy things live of the things of the temple ; and they which wait at the altar are partakers with the altar ? Even so hath the Lord ordained that they which preach the gospel should live of the gospel." There is, indeed, a sentimental and utterly spurious spirituality which either is, or affects to be, greatly shocked at hearing such things spoken of at all. The best and noblest of all kinds of spirituality is that which renders it unnecessary to speak of them ; and which, by promptly, cheerfully, liberally complying with Christ's own ordinance, having freely received, freely gives.

But, on the other hand, let it not for a moment be supposed that, in thus pleading for the just claims of the ministry, I am letting down or putting aside those higher motives by which all who join it ought to be chiefly moved. There is a very searching and solemn question upon this point put, at his ordination, to every minister of our Church :—"Are not zeal for the honour of God, love to Jesus Christ, and desire of saving souls, your great motives and chief inducements to enter into the functions of the holy ministry, and not worldly designs and interests ?" Alas, for the minister who cannot say "Yea" to that question with a good and honest heart. At the same time, there is surely nothing, either in the terms of that question, or in the nature of the case, to make it unsuitable for those whom the Church is asking to devote themselves to its service, to inquire and consider how far the Church is doing her part, in so providing for their support as that, if they take her sacred service in hand, they shall at least be placed in a position to go about their work without being burdened and distracted with the constant pressure of worldly anxieties and cares. Parents, we may be certain, will and do inquire and consider as to these things, in deciding how far they will use the great influence they so rightfully possess in encouraging even pious, gifted, and every way hopeful sons, to take that work in hand. These sons themselves—the more thoughtful they are, and the more they realise the difficulties and responsibilities of the ministerial office—will be the more alive to the formidable hindrances to efficiency and success, in the discharge of its sacred and arduous duties, which straitened circumstances and pecuniary difficulties must inevitably interpose. There are men, it is true, to whom even the lowest and most adequate provision our Church has ever made for any of her ministers would present no discouragement at all. There are men in every community on a level with such a state of things, and to whom our present equal dividend, small as it is, might even wear the aspect of a prize. There always have been, and there always will be, Levites "going to sojourn where they may find a place," and to whom the "ten shekels of silver by the year, and the suit of apparel, and the victuals," given by the man of Mount Ephraim to the Bethlehemite in the days of old, will be tempting entertainment. But these are not the men the Free Church would like to see in her pulpits. If, however, we would really desire to have, or be warranted to ask and expect from God, a continuation of men of altogether another class, of able ministers of the New Testament, of spiritual workmen who shall not need to be ashamed of the Church, nor the Church of them, we must do our duty towards them. We expect our ministers to be thoroughly

educated men—men who have passed through a long, laborious, and expensive training, for the places they are to fill—men qualified by their culture and character to mingle advantageously with all classes of their people. But what right have we to cherish any such expectations, if, after they have spent ten or twelve years of their life in fitting themselves for so important and difficult a position, they find a no higher remuneration awaiting them, in so far as the means of supporting them and their families are concerned, than would be offered to a common counting-house clerk, or to many a skilled artisan? This is plain speaking—to some, perhaps, it may be unpalatable speaking; but it needs to be heard. Great interests, not in this Church only, but in almost every true Church in Christendom, are at this moment depending on the sincerity and earnestness with which this question shall be taken up and dealt with by the people of God.

It can hardly be necessary for me to say that I have gone at such length into this part of my subject, not because I had any doubt as to either the intelligence and the sympathy of the members of this House regarding it. I have done so only because I have been hoping and aiming, through this Assembly, to speak to and to arouse the Church at large. And, for that purpose, there is only too much cause to believe that a special and urgent appeal is imperatively required.

But I must now address myself more immediately to the exposition of the particular method of augmenting the fund for the support of the ministry which is embodied in the proposal at present before you. It will be seen at once, from the terms of the third of the resolutions, according to which the scheme, if adopted, is to be carried out, that not only is it not to touch or to unsettle our existing equal dividend, but that it is meant, on the contrary, both to increase the amount and to strengthen the stability of that equal dividend. I, for one, am, and have always been, decidedly in favour of a solid equal dividend as the basis and backbone of our financial system. But I am not, and never was, in favour of an equal dividend to which there was to be no limit, and which should prohibit and exclude the introduction of all other means of increasing the stipends of our ministers. Had our Church been unwise enough to commit itself to any such communistic extravagance, our financial system would have gone to pieces long ago. Our whole system of supplements, which has existed ever since 1843, is a sufficient and conclusive proof that our Church never intended the equal dividend to be the one only source of ministerial support. The utmost extent to which our Church has ever engaged to carry the equal dividend system is £150. To that engagement my proposal is that the Church should adhere. It is an engagement, as we all know, and as has been already pointedly adverted to, which we never yet fully succeeded in making good. Nay, more; if there be anything which our past experience has proved, it is this—that we shall never be able to make good that engagement unless we can bring some force into play that will give fresh life and impart a new and abiding impulse to our Sustentation Fund scheme. This, at least, I can venture with confidence to say, that, aided by one of the largest, the best attended, the most united, the most intelligent and earnest-minded committees of which this Assembly and this Church enjoys the services, I have done my best to raise the equal dividend to the amount at which the Church has so long been aiming; and the

result is, that I see no reason to expect that, on the present footing, we shall be able to carry it higher than it now is, and not a little reason to fear that, in spite of our best exertions to prevent such an evil, it may rather fall off. I know, indeed, that this belief is becoming so general and so settled in the minds of many of the most liberal and enlightened friends of the Church, that, in despair of accomplishing anything more for our country ministers through the medium of a central fund, they are many of them already devising means of escaping from the difficulty in other and different ways. Some I know are betaking themselves to the idea of having separate and local funds for the ministers of their own individual Presbytery. Others, again, have been led to contemplate the raising of a separate and special fund, to be administered by a committee of the subscribers, in the way of augmenting the stipends of those ministers whose congregations shall be found to comply with the conditions the committee may prescribe. Now, I honestly confess that, while I thoroughly appreciate the generous spirit which prompts these movements, I should regard any attempt to carry them into effect with grave alarm. My firm conviction is, that we cannot, and must not, have two Sustentation Funds raised and administered apart from each other. In the long-run the one would inevitably prove fatal to the other.

What is proposed, in the measure now under discussion, is not only entirely free from every possible risk of injuring our present Equal Dividend Fund, but will inevitably and largely promote and perpetuate its prosperity. It is a measure which, instead of operating as a conflicting force against the Equal Dividend Fund, will operate as a conspiring force on its side, as the following words, which embody its fundamental provision, clearly show:—That, under this new measure, “the first and fundamental object of the Sustentation Fund shall be, as heretofore, to secure for all her ministers, who shall be entitled by the laws of the Church to receive it, an equal dividend of £150, and that the revenue of the fund shall be so appropriated accordingly to the whole extent necessary for this purpose.” Plainly, therefore, if this new measure succeeds at all, it is the equal dividend that will reap its first fruits. It is true that, after raising the equal dividend to £150, the remaining surplus of the fund will be administered on a principle different from that of the equal dividend. In this fact, indeed, lies the whole virtue and efficiency of the scheme. The surplus fund will go to increase the stipends of those ministers whose congregations, by their liberality to the fund, entitle themselves to receive this benefit from it. If all our congregations were able to give their ministers a suitable supplement, in addition to the equal dividend, there would, of course, be no need for any surplus fund such as it is now proposed to raise. But we are all perfectly well aware that the great mass of our rural congregations have no supplements to give—or none which are anything more than merely nominal. Here, for example, is a fact full of significance on that point. Last year the whole sum paid to the ministers of our Church in the form of supplementary stipends was £40,332, 13s. 1d.; but of that sum no less than £30,709, 6s. 10d, went to the ministers of town charges. Of these there are in our Church 178; so that, adding the supplements to the equal dividends, the average stipend of the 178 ministers, amounted to the very creditable sum of £316. But what comes, meanwhile, of the ministers of rural charges? Of these there are on the platform

of the equal dividend 592. Even if the whole £9623, 6s. 10½d. paid in the form of supplements to ministers of rural charges had been equally divided among them all, it would have given to each only £16, which, added to last year's equal dividend of £143, would have raised their entire stipend to no more than £159. Manifest therefore it is, beyond all possibility of dispute, that for the great mass of our country ministers the supplementary part of our financial system can do little or nothing. What we want, therefore, in connexion with our great central fund is, that, over and above the equal dividend which it provides for all, it should possess the means of doing, in at least some suitable measure, for the ministers of our poorer congregations, what our system of supplements effects for the ministers of our wealthier congregations.

In saying this, of course I don't mean as every one who examines the proposal now before the Assembly will at once perceive, that it is intended by it to introduce, in connexion with our central fund, anything so odious as a distinction between rich and poor congregations. We have always studiously avoided recognising such a distinction in administering our equal dividend—which goes, share and share alike, to the minister of St George's, Edinburgh, and to the minister of the remotest of the Shetland Isles. What is now proposed is, that substantially the same rule should be followed in administering the surplus fund. All, that is, who share in it at all, whether they be ministers of rich or poor, of town or country congregations, will share in it, on the footing of certain well-defined and uniform principles, applicable equally to all. But with this one exception, that there are certain congregations which it is proposed to exclude from participation in this surplus fund altogether. First, then, let me briefly advert to the conditions which are to exclude congregations from the benefits of the surplus fund; and next, let me notice the conditions which are to admit congregations to its benefits. Of the disqualifying conditions there are two. The one is, that no congregation giving less to the Sustentation Fund than £60 as its contribution for the year shall participate in the surplus fund. This may seem hard, but it is mainly, at least, the hardness of a necessity, under which we are placed by the limited pecuniary resources at our disposal. Every congregation contributing less than £60 to the Sustentation Fund, will, by receiving the usual dividend of £150, be costing the Church, at the very least, £90 a year. In fact, not a few of these congregations will be costing it sums ranging from £90 up to £120, and even to £130. The whole number of congregations included in this class is 146, and the average number of their Church members is 135. It is obvious from these facts, that it would not be a wise, or even a very warrantable policy, on the part of a Church like ours, to employ on behalf of such congregations any larger amount of those pecuniary means which the Divine Head of the Church places at her disposal for the support of gospel ordinances than she is doing already. It may be proper, at the same time, to state, that of the 146 congregations now alluded to, there are 58 which contribute annually to the Sustentation Fund upwards of £50; and that there are 13 which contribute upwards of £55. Of these, a very considerable number, if not the whole of them, would, in all probability, under the stimulus of the surplus fund, find it quite possible to rise to the sum which would bring them within the reach of its benefits. The other disqualifying condition applies to all congregations whose aggregate contribution, even although

it amounts to £60, or to any sum however much above that amount, does not come up to the average rate of 7s. 6d. a year per member.

Having thus noticed the conditions which, according to the proposed scheme, are to exclude congregations from participating in the surplus fund, I shall now advert to the conditions which are to admit congregations to share in its benefits. These conditions are, simply and only, certain average rates of contribution. This is, in truth, the grand distinctive feature of the scheme, and that in which, if carried into effect, its great strength will be found to lie. What we require, above all other things, is to raise the general standard, or rate, of giving to the fund. It would, of course, be altogether wrong to pitch that standard too high for ordinary country congregations to reach. But that 7s. 6d. is not too high an average rate per member, must be tolerably apparent from these two facts; first, that it amounts to less than three halfpence a week; and next, that, even at present, without the aid of any stimulus whatever to induce congregations to increase their rate of giving to the fund, there are no fewer than 458 of our congregations on the equal dividend fund, that have already reached the minimum average rate per member now proposed. Of the whole number of our congregations, therefore, which contribute £60 and upwards annually to the Sustentation Fund, there are only 168 which would require to increase their contributions in order to get immediately within the range of the surplus fund. But while an average contribution of 7s. 6d. a year per member will place any congregation that gives to the fund annually £60 and upwards upon the platform of the surplus fund, it is to be observed that this platform has two stages, a lower and a higher. To reach the higher stage, and to enjoy its double benefit, the average rate of contribution per member must be 10s. Of congregations that give at and above this rate, we have at present 246, and of these a very considerable number are among the humblest of our country congregations. I believe there is no one competently acquainted with the subject, who doubts that the above number of congregations might at once be doubled without anything approaching to pressure. In our country congregations generally there are no seat-rents. Their contributions to the Sustentation Fund are, therefore, their only contributions for the support of gospel ordinances. I suppose that, of the Church extension charges, whether in town or country, which for years past we have been setting up, there is scarcely one which had not to agree to raise an average contribution of 10s. per member, in order to receive sanction from the Assembly. That sum amounts to only 10d. a month, or rather less than 2½d. a week. It is, therefore, my decided conviction that there is no valid reason why five-sixths, or even nine-tenths of all our congregations should not rise to the average rate of contribution now named. And if this were done, our financial difficulties would be at an end. We have a membership in the Free Church at present nearly approaching to 250,000. Ten shillings from each member would, therefore, give us more than our whole present income, donations included. That income last year amounted to about £120,000. With the excess arising from the multitude of congregational contributions, which go indefinitely and largely above the average of 10s., added to this amount, we should at once have a revenue that would enable us with ease to accomplish everything at which the present movement aims.

Of course the question—and it is the great question—remains, Will the proposal now before the Assembly do anything effectual in the way of promoting such a general rise in the contributions of the Church? To that question nothing but time and a fair trial can furnish a conclusive answer. But this at least is plain, that while, as long and large experience has proved, there is absolutely nothing in our present system to produce or preserve the desired rise in the rate of contributions, the measure now before us would bring into play motives and inducements both with the aid-getting and the aid-giving congregations, that could hardly fail to tell in favour of such a result, and with a very powerful force. The prospect of getting for their ministers the important help of the surplus fund, would be a constant incentive to every right-hearted aid-receiving congregation to rise from its present 5s. or 6s. contribution to at least the lower qualifying point of 7s. 6d., while it would press with an equally wholesome effect on those aid-receiving congregations which have already reached that point to struggle up to the higher level of the 10s., and thereby to receive for their minister the corresponding benefit. As regards the aid-giving congregations, on the other hand, the consideration which at present so often and injuriously restrains their liberality, would, by this new plan, be completely taken away. They would now have a solid assurance that their increased liberality would no longer be thrown away, and that to its whole extent it would really go to the accomplishment of the great object to which they were devoting it—that, namely, of providing a more adequate stipend for the great body of our poorer-paid ministers.

But while, on such grounds as these, I venture confidently to think that this scheme which I have laid on the table, has in it such elements of success as to entitle it not merely to the favourable consideration of the Assembly, but to a fair trial at the hands of the Church, I am very far from regarding it as a perfect scheme. Our present system is very far from being a perfect scheme; and this, at least, I will take it upon me to say, and would engage, if need were, to show, that there is no defect or inconvenience which can be fairly charged against the measure I am now laying before the Assembly, which is not chargeable in a far stronger degree against our present system; and with this important difference in addition, that while this new proposal would tend to lessen the defects and inconveniences now existing, and would put us in a far better position for dealing with even the very worst of them, the present system leaves all these evils to go on undiminished and unrestrained. That the scheme should be looked at all round is not what I deprecate, it is what I earnestly desire. But I do deprecate that hyper-criticism that exhausts its ingenuity in picking holes and finding faults—and not less do I deprecate that utopian criticism which, because the scheme is not a panacea, fitted infallibly to cure every possible existing or imaginable ill to which our present financial system is liable, at once decries it, and declares, with oracular voice, that it is naught. For example, one objector may say that, under this scheme, the simple fact of some single wealthy member of a congregation leaving it, may pull down the congregational rate of giving below the 10s. average rate, or even below the 7s. 6d. average rate, and thereby deprive the congregation of the benefits of the surplus fund. It is quite true—such a thing may occur. But, at the worst, it will still leave the minister of the congregation better off

than he is at present. At present he has only £144, he will then have, at least, the higher and uniform dividend of £150. But, I believe, the thing supposed would happen very rarely. The very fact that such a result was likely to arise would go far to prevent it. It would probably lead the wealthy member of the congregation not to withdraw his important contribution at all, or, at least, not suddenly and all at once—not until the congregation had found means to make up for the loss of it. And, moreover, the very risk of such a danger would have this next important effect. It would lead congregations to lean less on the larger contributions of any individual member, and more on the maintenance of a good average among the members as a body. Again, another objector may say, We have congregations with four, five, six, or even eight hundred members, whose average rate of contribution is only four or five shillings. It would cost them much less to give a good supplement to their ministers than to raise their average contribution to the point that would qualify them to participate in the surplus fund. I answer, once more, It is quite true. But, I ask, at the same time, are not these congregations giving their ministers a good supplement at present? I know they are; and just for that very reason the proposal now before the Assembly does not concern itself with them. Their ministers have a tolerably fair stipend already. If any of them get it, to any extent, at the expense of their congregations not acting fairly towards the Sustentation Fund, let the Church deal with these congregations, and get the wrong repaired if it can. This is not a scheme to rectify such evils. It makes no pretence of meddling with supplements at all. Its one single but all-important object is to get an adequate stipend for that large class of our ministers who either have no supplement at all, or none that is worth the naming. I do hope, therefore, that whatever is done or decided in reference to the proposal now under discussion, it will not be made responsible for evils which it neither originated nor pretends to cure, nor be pooh-poohed and put aside, because under it, in particular cases, hardships may, in the course of providence, arise. If the scheme should not always be able to prevent or remove these hardships, it will at least, in every case, lessen and alleviate them by securing a higher equal dividend than has been hitherto received. In a word, if this scheme succeeds to the extent of adding even so little as one-tenth to the present income of our Sustentation Fund, it would thereby accomplish these two things:—in the first place, it would raise the equal dividend, for all ministers, to £150; and, in the next place, it would leave, besides, a surplus fund amounting to £7000, to be employed in adding to the stipend of the ministers of every congregation which had given, during the year, 7s. 6d. and upwards, as its average contribution, per member, to the Sustentation Fund.

To enable us to judge of the addition which would thus be made, and of the working of the proposed scheme, let us suppose that, as at present, we had 212 congregations contributing at and above the lower average of 7s. 6d., but at less than the higher average of 10s. per member, and therefore each entitled, under the proposed scheme, to a single share. Let us suppose still further, that, as at present, we had also 246 congregations contributing at and above the higher average of 10s. per member, and therefore each entitled to a double share. In these circumstances the supposed surplus fund of £7000 would be distributed as fol-

lows:—The ministers of the 212 congregations, contributing at the lower rate, would each receive from the surplus fund £9, 18s. 10d., which, together with the equal dividend of £150, would raise his whole stipend from the Sustentation Fund to close upon £160. And the ministers of the 246 congregations, contributing at the higher rate, would each receive from the surplus fund £19, 17s. 8d.; which, together with his equal dividend of £150, would raise his stipend from the Sustentation Fund to close upon £170. It will, of course, be understood that in making the supposition on which the foregoing calculations have proceeded, I have not been pointing at the increase to the fund for which I actually look. If the scheme commend itself to the approval of the Assembly, and be vigorously carried out over the Church at large, I anticipate an increase to the fund very greatly in advance of that which, merely for the sake of illustration, I have just assumed. By that illustration it was my sole object to show that, with even a very limited amount of success, the scheme would be productive of highly important results.

I am quite aware there are some who, while highly approving of this scheme of a surplus fund, and anticipating great things from it, if once it were brought fairly into play, are discouraged by the initial difficulty which stands in its way. The initial difficulty which they dread is that of getting the equal dividend up to £150; of getting it up, that is, to the point at which the surplus fund begins to arise and to take effect. They look, in short, on the distance which divides our present equal dividend from the ultimate point of £150, as if it were an impassable gulf never to be got over. But before any one allows himself to be scared by that imagination, let me ask the members of Assembly to consider what that imagination implies. It implies that the intelligence and the conscience of the Church are to remain entirely unmoved by those grave considerations to which reference was made in the earlier part of this address. It implies that our people care so little for the hardships which so many of our ministers and their families at present endure, and are so indifferent to the hurtful consequences to the interests of our Church and to the cause of Christ in this land, that must inevitably follow from the continuance of that state of things, that they will do nothing more for the support of the ministry than they are doing now. If that were true, it would, of course, be conclusive against the success, not only of this particular scheme, but of any scheme in behalf of our great central fund that can be proposed. But I don't believe that to be true. I believe nothing like that to be true. My firm conviction, on the contrary is, that the only thing wanted in order to evoke the cordial sympathy of our people in support of a movement to make a more adequate provision for the support of the ministry, is, first, to arrest their attention on the subject; to get them to take a fresh look at it, and at their own responsibilities in connexion with it. And next, to bring before them a good plan—a plan based on right and reasonable principles—a plan that will present a wholesome and effective stimulus to the aid-receiving congregations to rise to a higher rate of giving, and which, by the very fact of its doing so, will powerfully influence and encourage the aid-giving congregations to increase their liberality by giving them the assurance that their enlarged contributions will be chiefly employed in helping those who are the most strenuous in helping themselves. It is under the conviction now expressed that this plan has been prepared, and that I have

used the great liberty of obtruding upon the Assembly this lengthened address regarding it.

May I venture, before sitting down, to speak, most humbly and affectionately, a few words in connexion with this deeply important subject, to my fathers and brethren in the ministry. Hitherto I have been making my appeal, through this Assembly, to the members of the Church. I now make my appeal, beloved brethren and fathers, through our revered and honoured Moderator, to you. In order to the success of the cause I have been pleading, the members of the Church have one duty to discharge, and we have another. If we would entitle ourselves to reap their carnal things, we must be earnest and unwearied in sowing unto them spiritual things. It is "the labourer," not "the idler," who is worthy of his hire. It is the true shepherd, who faithfully and lovingly feeds the flock, and not the hireling, who neglects it, who alone has a claim to eat of the milk of the flock. Woe to the shepherds of Israel, who feed themselves, and of whom the Lord has to say, "The diseased have ye not strengthened, neither have ye healed that which was sick, neither have ye bound up that which was broken, neither have ye brought again that which was driven away, neither have ye sought out that which was lost." Better, ten thousandfold, that a ministry should be poor, and yet, by its faithfulness, "making many rich," than to be rich as to this world, and yet, by its unfaithfulness, "making many poor." Would that, like the great apostle, we were "with our people at all seasons, after such a manner," that, like him, when leaving them, we might be able, each of us, to say, "Wherefore I take you to record this day that I am pure from the blood of all men." If this good conscience towards God, as regards our ministry, be not what, at least, we strive and pray to possess, we have no warrant either to expect or to ask even a temporal reward. But if we do this, truly caring for God's people, He will not fail to put it into their hearts to care for us.

In speaking as I have now done, it is very far from my purpose to convey, or to countenance the idea that ministers have no part to perform in the way of directly promoting and working out the scheme before us. Without their personal aid and oversight, it will and can, in many places, make little progress. But what I do especially mean to say to my brethren and to myself is this, that by far the greatest and most lasting impulse we can give to this movement will be that which it indirectly receives from the earnestness and prayerfulness with which we prosecute our pulpit and pastoral labours, and with which we watch for souls as those who must give account. I know, indeed, that this which I have now expressed is the very thought which is deepest in my brethren's minds—deeper far in the minds of many of them than in my own. I have presumed, notwithstanding, to give it utterance, as feeling how much I myself need more vividly and habitually to realise it, and as desiring to give the assurance to our people that, when we venture to press home that great duty of adequately supporting the Christian ministry, which we consider to be binding upon them, we are not forgetting that there is a co-relative duty, and one of even greater solemnity, which is equally binding upon us—the duty of taking heed to ourselves, and to all the flock over which the Holy Ghost hath made us overseers, to feed the flock of God which He hath purchased with His own blood.

And now, with a brief word to my esteemed fathers and brethren in the eldership, I shall bring this address to a close. In dealing with such a question as the one now before the Assembly, it needs not to say that the very foremost place does and must belong to you. On such a question you are the natural leaders of the members of the Church. On such a question it is only a certain and limited length to which the ministers can or ought to go. The great Scripture principles bearing on it, they owe it to the great Head of the Church and to you, faithfully and fully to open up and proclaim. As regards, however, the working out of these principles in their practical applications and details, it is to you and your colleagues in the deaconship, at least in all our larger and more important congregations, the Church must chiefly look. The service which, in this department, as in many others, you have already rendered to the Church, it is impossible to over-estimate; and I confidently anticipate that, if approved and sanctioned by the Assembly, the new effort which it is proposed to make will receive your warm and energetic support. Without this, it must obviously and inevitably fail. If you have no strong sense of the need of such an effort, or no faith in the method of carrying out that effort which the committee have proposed, it were better far to set it at once aside, than thus to go into it without either heart or hope. If we are really to face, as a great duty and necessity—which I honestly and earnestly believe it to be—the work which the proposal on the table places before us, we must do so with our eyes open to the labour and liberality which it will require at our hands. We must keep the broad fact full in view, that if we are to succeed in this noble movement to the whole extent at which it aims, we must contrive to add one-third to the present amount of our contributions. For myself, I mean to do so, and I trust the resolution will be general. At present the income of our fund is about £120,000; and we must raise it to about £160,000. That means that the poor man who gives at present threepence a month to this fund shall henceforth give fourpence; that the man who gives sixpence a month should give eightpence; that the man who gives ninepence should give a shilling; and, ascending to a higher scale of contributions, this proposal means that the man who gives £1 a month should henceforth give £1, 6s. 8d.; that the man who gives £2 should give £2, 13s. 4d.; that the man who gives £6 should give £8; and so on to the highest of the many generous contributions which this fund receives. Of course, there may be found individuals in every congregation who cannot make such an increase as I have now named. But there may also, I trust, be found in every congregation individuals, and these not few, who both can and will go the length of doubling or even trebling their present contributions. In their forward march, the cry of those whom I have described as the natural leaders of the Christian people in such a movement, must be, "Grenadiers, to the front." The position taken up by the office-bearers will go far to determine the position that will be taken up by the members of the congregations. Above all, and in conclusion—and this I say to ministers, elders, deacons, and members of the Church alike—if we are to enter on this movement, as I earnestly hope we shall, and that with one mind and soul, let us cast ourselves, in carrying it forward, upon Him to whom the silver and the gold belong, and who has the hearts of all men in

His hand, and who has but to touch even the flinty rock and make the waters gush forth.

Mr WILSON, Dundee, moved—"That the General Assembly approve of and adopt the resolution regarding the increase and distribution of the Sustentation Fund submitted by the Convener of the Sustentation Fund Committee; and authorise and instruct the Committee to make an earnest appeal on behalf of this movement to all the office-bearers and members of the Church, and to use all suitable and competent means to insure its success. Further, the Assembly instruct the Sustentation Fund Committee to meet and prepare a scheme for the visitation of Presbyteries on its behalf, to be submitted to a future diet of this Assembly, with a view to the Assembly appointing special meetings of Presbyteries to confer with deputies from the Sustentation Fund Committee." Mr Wilson said he would not at present address the Assembly, contenting himself with simply proposing the motion; but if, in the course of the discussion, objections should be stated or difficulties mentioned, he should avail himself of the right of reply, in order, if possible, to remove such objections and difficulties. He would further move what he was sure would meet with the cordial approval of the Assembly, that Dr Buchanan be requested to print and publish the address he had just delivered. (Cheers.)

Mr FERGUSON, (elder,) Dundee, seconded the motion. He cordially joined in the hope expressed by the rev. doctor in introducing the subject, that this matter be looked at in all its bearings, because it is obviously one of very considerable importance, involving, as it does, changes in the administration of this Fund. Whatever might be the reception which the scheme might meet at the hands of that House, and whatever difference of opinion might be developed in the course of the conversation that was now to ensue, there could be no controversy, at all events, that the scheme was inspired by an earnest and generous wish to apply the proper remedy to a great and clamant evil, the inadequate remuneration of the ministry. As to the existence of that evil, unhappily there is no room for doubt; and he very much feared that among those present there might be some who could speak from painful personal experience. He was not going to depreciate the great results which the history of the Sustentation Fund supplies. To do so would be most ungracious toward our people, and ungrateful toward a higher Power. But great as these results have been, and far surpassing what has been achieved in former days, still the Church has failed to come up to what it was at first proposed to do, when, twenty-four years ago, she with her own hands burst the links that bound her to the State. (Applause.) It was expected, as a reasonable and practicable arrangement, that we should be able to afford a minimum dividend to each minister of £150. Well, twenty-four years have gone, and we have not even yet reached the promise of that time; and if we look back to the *vidimus* in the preface to the report, it will be found that the dividend is very little more than it was eleven years ago. So far from getting into the promised land, it almost looks as if we had made up our minds to die in the wilderness. (Applause and laughter.) At any rate, unless we get on a little faster than we have been doing, it is pretty clear that the forty years shall have expired before we touch the frontier of the promised land. (Hear, hear.) We have failed hitherto to realise this £150, which, for a quarter of a

century, has been dangling before our eyes; and from whatever cause it may be that we have so failed, it cannot be from want of ability on the part of the people. The sum of £6000 additional revenue would bring up the dividend to £150. As Dr Buchanan has stated, we have somewhere about a quarter of a million of members in this Church, and an additional average contribution of a halfpenny a month, or sixpence a year, would bring us up to the sum required; so that whatever may be the cause of the deficiency, it would be utterly ridiculous to impute it to want of ability on the part of the people. The causes seem to be not very far to seek. In the first place, something, no doubt, is due to the influence of habit. People have got into the habit of giving so much a week, or so much a month; and they just go on at that rate, affording another illustration of the saying that—

“ Evil is wrought for want of thought,
As well as want of heart.”

(Hear.) Custom has woven its web around them, and it is not easily rent. Then there is another and deeper seated cause, which, no doubt, must be touched upon with delicacy—though it would be false delicacy to ignore it here—and the evil here at once suggests the very direction in which the remedy is to be sought. It might have been predicted on general grounds that among individuals and congregations some would be found evading their fair share in keeping up the Sustentation Fund. The only way to endeavour to get a remedy for this evil under which the Church labours is to get up some scheme which shall afford a test, according to which congregations shall, to some extent, reap in proportion as they have sown. (Hear, hear.) Now, if any gentleman thinks that the scheme which has been prepared by Dr Buchanan is an invasion of the principle of an equal dividend, he ought to remember, in the first place, that if this scheme is to operate at all, the very first thing it would do would be to raise the equal dividend to £150; then, but not till then, a differential plan, as it may be called in the language of commerce, comes into play. Then, in the second place, the fact of a Sustentation Fund is not exhausted by the idea of an equal dividend—it is no such one-sided affair as that. The principle of a Sustentation Fund embodies two ideas, which are the essential correlatives of each other; one, no doubt, is, that there shall be an equal dividend, but the other is, that all parties shall bear their fair share in the raising of that dividend. (Hear, hear.) It must be first a willing mind, and then, but not till then, that it shall be accepted according to what a man hath, and not according to what he hath not. (Hear, hear.) This is no new-fangled idea; the distinguished man to whose genius we owe the conception, and to whose energy we owe the establishment of the Sustentation Fund, in about the last production from his pen on the Economics of the Free Church of Scotland, in a passage commencing with the words, “ There is a pleasure in giving all needful help to parties who at the same time are doing all they can to help themselves,” recognises this idea, and says, “ The only way in which the two ends are to be met is, that the richer congregations shall give as much as they might, and the poorer seek as little as they might”—in short, that each class shall come “ as nearly up to the dividend as they can.” That is just the scheme now proposed, and the great beauty of it is, that it makes the right to the Equal Dividend not what the congregations shall raise in the gross but what they shall

raise per member ; so that a congregation of 160 persons raising 10s. a head, or in the gross only £80, will come in just as much as a congregation of 800 or 1000 raising £400 or £500, or before them if they fail in that. In connexion with the working of the scheme generally, the House should remember that there never was a time more favourable for testing the resources of the equal dividend than the last four or five years. During that time, until recently, though things have somewhat changed now, the tide of affluence has flowed in this country in greater depth and volume than ever it did before. But the Sustentation Fund has not grown with the increase of wealth. Eleven years ago the equal dividend was £140 ; and anybody knows that that was a great deal more than £150 would be now. As regards the scheme great pains must be taken to explain it, and it is to be hoped office-bearers and others will not grudge the attention necessary to do this. Of course, the scheme will not remove all anomalies. It may exclude some congregations that ought to be included, and include others that ought to be excluded. That is incident to all schemes applicable to human affairs, but the scheme is one certainly deserving of hearty support, as an earnest attempt to solve a problem than which there is at present no more important social question— putting it on no higher ground—the better remuneration of the ministry. (Hear, hear.)

Mr CHARLES COWAN, of Valleyfield, said he had always held, and held now as strongly as ever, that nothing would content him short of the ministers of the Free Church being placed in a position at least as good as that which they possessed when ministers of the Established Church. There was a moral obligation binding upon the eldership and the people of Scotland to supplement to the full all that had been taken away ; and he was not without hope that now they would feel they had a debt of honour and gratitude to discharge, and that from this day forth a more hearty and generous response would be given to the appeal which had been made to his fellow-churchmen. Two considerations he wished to advert to in connexion. One was the scanty supply of students for the ministry, regarding which he asked how could it be otherwise when the remuneration in other professions was so much higher. His second observation had reference to the great work accomplished through means of the Sustentation Fund in the closes and lanes of our great cities. We were hearing of impending changes in our constitution, and he regarded it as of the utmost importance that they should endeavour to erect what he might call a conservative element in these localities, and to impregnate them with a body who would fear God and honour the queen. He was reminded of the memorable words of Dr Chalmers, that the Sustentation Fund was the sheet-anchor of the Church ; if there was any flaw in that anchor, very serious results were likely to arise, and if the crew of the Free Church were compelled to leave the good ship Free Church for want of provisions—encompassed as it was with so many enemies, and tossed as it had been in so tempestuous a sea—that would be an event which the country at large would have cause deeply to deplore. He trusted that, as the result of this discussion, a substantial addition to the fund would be made from all parts of the country.

Mr MILLER, of Leithen, said he had been all along what is called an

equal dividend man, and he held he was so still ; but at the same time he gave to Dr Buchanan's plan, now before the House, his most cordial assent. (Applause.) It was unnecessary to say a single word about the great need they had for a scheme of this sort, and he believed Dr Buchanan's plan would enable them to do something towards remedying the present state of matters. To his brother elders especially, he would say that a great deal lay on their shoulders, and he knew from experience that if the elders would put their shoulders to the wheel, and explain to the congregations what is really meant by this equal dividend and by this Sustentation Fund, it would go far towards attaining the object they had in view. He had been over several congregations during last winter, and he had been amazed to see the want of information on this great question. He would suggest that the elders should take the trouble to meet with their own and other congregations, and indoctrinate the people of the Church as to what it is that is really wanted. In some places he had found the old scheme of a penny a week was thought to be enough to pay to the Sustentation Fund. That was never intended to be stereotyped as the measure of the givings of the Church. We are thankful to the large givers, but the permanent burden in the matter of this most important fund must rest upon the mass of the members of the Church. He would ask the Church to remember that, in carrying out the scheme now proposed, they were only doing bare justice to the ministers, for £200 now-a-days was not equal to £150 twenty-four years ago ; and he would have liked to see the Church going a good bit further, and acting with a little generosity, as a reward for the arduous labours and services of their ministers. (Applause.)

Mr PETER DENNY, Dumbarton, (elder,) rose for the purpose of speaking to a practical question, or how to get the money necessary to carry out the views which had been so eloquently set before them that day. In the Presbytery of Dumbarton they had had what he might call a congress of the office-bearers within the bounds in the month of April or in March last. The subject was then very seriously discussed, and the hardships of their ministers were eloquently set forth. They had occasion to speak of the abuses that existed, and how to remedy them ; and to their shame they found that one of the chief abuses lay with the elders and deacons. One of the abuses consisted in the deacons allowing their office to be a sinecure, in so far as the collection of the contributors was concerned, as they allowed this duty to be discharged by ladies. It was, however, resolved that an end should be put to this abuse, and he was able to speak from experience of the benefit of the change ; for he found that after a month or two the contributions which he received were very largely increased. (Applause.) It was true that at first he did not altogether like the work, but by and by he began to like it ; and as an inducement for his brother deacons to follow his example, he could assure them that a deacon could with more power enforce the claims of the Sustentation Fund than ladies. In proof of this he might state that he had ascertained that three other deacons in the congregation with which he was connected had adopted the same course, and their experience was precisely that of his own. He might also state that at the meeting to which he referred an admirable letter, written by a gentleman, had been submitted ; and in this document it was pointed out that there were many gentlemen of considerable means

who did not contribute the amount they might be willing and were able to do, seeing that they found that the people in the congregations did not do what they ought, and would rely on any extra contributions they might make. In order to meet this, it was suggested in this document that those parties who were not disposed to give the additional sum through their own congregation ought to send what they could spare to headquarters. This had, he knew, been given effect to in his own Presbytery. The meeting in the Presbytery of Dumbarton had resolved that an attempt should be made to increase the contributions one-fourth, so that a minimum stipend of £200 should be aimed at. He had since ascertained that in order to attain this end the increase should be one-third, and he had no doubt that this would be put right in course of time. He had every reason to believe that in his congregation the additional one-fourth would be raised; and he also hoped that the same result would be secured in the other congregations in the Presbytery. When once his congregation had attained the position to which he alluded, it would be able to speak with power to the Presbytery of Dumbarton; and if that Presbytery could be brought into the same position, it could approach the Synod, and the success of such a movement would tell upon the whole Church. (Applause.)

Mr TULLOCH, of Livingstone, approved of this scheme, which embodied the principle of an equal dividend with checks in the right direction. He thought the scheme proposed was one characterised by much wisdom, and he trusted it would be very cordially adopted by the Assembly. The checks which they hitherto had, went in the way of merely affecting the minister and not the parties who were the givers to the fund. In this new scheme there was to be a certain average rate of contribution per communicant taken. But it seemed to him that much care would require to be taken just about this very thing. In connexion with this he suggested that in cases where the rate was kept at a certain average in consequence of there being a few wealthy contributors, while the rest of the communicants did not contribute their fair share, the sums subscribed by the former parties should be deducted, and the average rate taken upon the sums contributed by the bulk of the congregation. In illustrating his remarks on this point he cited the case of a congregation which had 916 members, and raised £630 for the Sustentation Fund. The average rate, if taken upon the whole, would come to 13s. or 14s.; but if they deducted eight communicants who gave £408, the figures would then stand as follows:—908 communicants contributing only £226, and leaving an average contribution of only 5s. per communicant. Another remark which he had to make was, that it would be found that the largest, or among the largest, contributions in the Church, according to membership, were to be found amongst some of the smaller congregations. In making these remarks his object was to express the hope that when the scheme came to be adopted and fairly worked in the Church, those having its management would keep in view the facts he had brought forward, and the class of which they were representatives, when striking the average of contribution per communicant. He also hoped that the large contributors in the different congregations would throw in their influence, so as to co-operate with the Sustentation Fund Committee, in order that the scheme might be worked to the greatest advantage.

Dr M'LAUCHLAN thought it due to Dr Buchanan, as well as to themselves, that some of those who had been all along supporters of the principle of an equal dividend should state how they felt in respect to this scheme. He rose, therefore, for the purpose of expressing how heartily and cordially he assented to the proposal of Dr Buchanan. If he was charged with inconsistency, he would say that, if committed to the principle of an equal dividend, he was not committed to it beyond the sum of £150 a year. Then he thought the scheme entitled to a fair trial from all parties, especially as a definite time was fixed within which the scheme should be tried. This scheme was free from the objection of visiting the failures of congregations upon the ministers. In regard to the Highlands, they must remember that the communicants were an exceedingly small proportion of the congregation, and the principle hitherto adopted was to reckon two-thirds of the adherents in the Highland congregations as equal to the communicants in a Lowland congregation. But he thought this regulation would require to be revised; the proportion was too high; he thought they should take half of the adherents as a fairer estimate of the proportion which might be reckoned as members in the sense of contributors.

Dr R. J. BROWN made some remarks, which, as far as they could be heard, were to the effect that care should be taken to secure that congregations should not lose the stimulus of direct personal return, by having their increased liberality merely distributed over the Church.

Mr ROSE, Minard, said,—Moderator, in the note appended to the Sustentation Fund Committee's report, it is stated that the Highland congregations are to be rated, not according to membership, but that two-thirds of the sitters are to be regarded as the membership for the purposes of the new scheme. I wish the Assembly distinctly to understand that, if the Sustentation Fund Committee act on this principle, the whole synod to which I belong will be at once cut off from any interest whatever in the new scheme. And I protest that if a principle not suitable to our circumstances, and not acted upon in other parts of the Church be applied to us, in self defence we shall be compelled to act on the principle of seat-letting, and making our returns accordingly. I wish this to be distinctly understood. Hitherto, I believe, in our Highland congregations the actual attendance has been returned as sitters; but if we are to be treated by the Sustentation Fund Committee in the exceptional way proposed, we must just, in self defence, adopt your way of letting seats, and making our returns accordingly; and I protest, that if our returns shall be found henceforth to be different from what they have hitherto been, this shall be the explanation of it. Sir, I desire to acknowledge the benefit the Sustentation Fund has conferred on the Highlands, and our high appreciation of the services of Dr Buchanan, convener of Sustentation Committee. I would not have us suspected of ingratitude, either to the Church or to him, in this respect. But while I make this acknowledgment, to which I suppose my brethren from the Highlands will adhere, we would not be understood as doing so in *forma pauperis*. We had, and still have, a right to participation in this fund, on its broad basis of an equal dividend. It was the understanding on which we adhered at the Disruption; and we have on the whole kept our contract with you. The moral influence of our adherence is yours still, as it was then, and in our contributions to this fund, if we cannot boast of being

perfect more than others, we have at least been progressing; and at our last meeting of synod it was found that over our bounds we are £200 this year in advance of the previous year.

Moderator, parties in the Lowlands can have little conception of the character of our congregations as to their pecuniary resources. Our young men, and women too, many of them, leave us in the spring for work in various parts. The young men go to fishing and other occupations; the young women, I am sorry to say, many of them to field labour. We are thus left, during the summer months, with congregations consisting chiefly of old men, women, and children. When the young people return to remain at home during the dead season of the year, they are, to a large extent, without any employment. We are thus situated in a position entirely different from your congregations, whose members and adherents have access to work all the year round. Ours, to a large extent, are absent from us for the whole summer season, and unemployed during the rest. We can indeed, properly speaking, have only one contribution from them annually; and it is in vain to expect 7s. 6d. each from them in their circumstances. I think, Moderator, we have reason to complain of the position into which the regulation of the Sustentation Committee puts us; and as stated already we shall just have to defend ourselves by seat-letting, as you do, if the Committee persevere in a method of treatment unsuitable to our circumstances.

Mr BARN, Garioch, said that he highly approved of the plan just laid on the table of the Assembly. He felt assured that, though it might, for a time, cause a diminution of the Communion Roll, it would doubtless raise the Sustentation Fund, as it provides for the recompense of individual or congregational effort—the want of which provision has hitherto been the chief defect connected with our excellent Sustentation Fund. In illustration of discouragement arising through this defect he might mention the case of his own congregation. His congregation had been originally rated at £84 a year for the Sustentation Fund, and on receiving a communication from headquarters, he had used his influence, and succeeded in bringing them up to £100. But the minimum dividend of £150 did not follow. There then came the one-fourth more movement, which his congregation entered into heartily, and completely carried out what was expected of them. But the £150 dividend did not come. Next came a request for one-eighth more, which his congregation also achieved. (Applause.) But the £150 dividend was not yet in sight at all. (Laughter.) They were still appealed to, and he was almost ashamed to come to the people again, in the circumstances; but he said to them that if they helped him to get above the aid-receiving point and keep there, he would not ask them to do more. They made the effort, and had come above the equal dividend; but they felt it somewhat mortifying that every communication they received appealed to them to come out of the aid-receiving into the aid-giving. Many individuals and congregations, it is well known, made great exertions to increase their contributions and raise the Fund; but a greater number, it is evident, did not, and so particular effort was swamped in general apathy. The provisions of the plan before the House tend to remedy this evil. The interesting statistics just given by Dr Buchanan, of the great rise in prices and wages, whilst the Sustentation Fund has risen so little, are eminently calculated to advocate with success the claim of ministers to a rise in their income.

He had seldom seen an argument have greater effect, than one of this class he had lately used in addressing a meeting of deacons and collectors on the subject before us. A young man, whom they all knew, of common school education, had just been appointed as one of the agents of an Agricultural Company, with a salary of £300 a year. If this young man—he set before them—might set his heart on being a minister of Christ, he would require to face eight or ten years more of expensive education, and then, if called to a charge would have to sit down with a provision for his support less than the half of his present income. The Lord seemed to be rebuking the Church and the world for the small provision made for His servants. Unsanctified talents were permitted to darken to a most alarming extent the ecclesiastical atmosphere. How solemn and just a retribution would it be that there should not be found in the Church the light and wisdom of sanctified talent to expose and dispel this darkness, seeing the provision made by the Church for her ministers is so far below what men of talent may obtain in almost any other department of life. All honour to men of talent who face and submit to the sacrifice thus imposed on them, but all shame to the Church that subjects them to this sacrifice.

Dr LONGMUIR asked what was to be reckoned a member in the sense of this scheme? Was it a member who was a contributor, was it one who had sat down at the communion table during the year, or was it one who was simply on the roll of membership? He would suggest, in order to get rid of the difficulty, that they should substitute the word contributor for member.

Mr SPENCE, Houndwood, said that, in his Presbytery, their experience had been similar to that which had been spoken of by Mr Bain in regard to his congregation.

Mr WILSON said, as there had been no counter-motion, his remarks would be very brief. In reference to Dr Longmuir's question, he really thought there was no difficulty whatever. The word "members" means communicants on the roll, and it was evident that, in order to work out the scheme honestly and efficiently, some care would require to be used by the Presbyteries in making up the rolls of communicants. In answer to Mr Ferguson, he said that his experience in the working of the Sustentation Fund hitherto warranted him in saying that the ten shilling contributors were not those likely to stand still. They were the congregations that had hitherto met all appeals made to them, and he was confident they would not fail in responding to the call now made. The only other difficulty started was with reference to the Highlands. It was proposed in the scheme that they should rate the membership of the Highlands at two-thirds of the sitters, but Dr M'Lauchlan seemed to think this was somewhat too high, and that it would bear hardly upon the Highland congregations, while another member thought it was too high, in respect of the great poverty especially in the Western Islands. Now, in regard to the first objection, he did not think numerically two-thirds was too high as compared with the proportion of members to sitters in our Lowland congregations. In the Lowlands the average number of sittings occupied from Sabbath to Sabbath was about equal to the number on the communicants' roll. Of course the other difficulty was one of a more serious kind, and ultimately it might come out that in the working of this or any other scheme of the Sustentation Fund it

might be necessary to deal with some cases as exceptional, but he would ask his Highland brethren to have patience for a year or two and allow them vigorously to work out the scheme for a period of three years, so that experience might teach them what amendments they might require to make upon it. It was not a money benefit chiefly or exclusively that they expected from the vigorous working out of this scheme. He believed the appeal which it was proposed to make to the membership of the Free Church on behalf of the Christian ministry would be the means of quickening the spiritual and religious earnestness both of the ministers and people of the Church.

The motion was then unanimously agreed to.

CHARGES CONTRIBUTING UNDER £50.

Mr WILSON then submitted the report with regard to charges contributing at and under £50 per annum, (No. xxvii.) A sub-committee had communicated with all the congregations in this position, numbering 94, and directing their attention to the fact that these congregations had cost the Church not less than £10,000 over and above the amount of their contributions, while not a few others were actually showing a decrease in their contributions for the current year. They had been urged to endeavour to lighten this burden, and of the communicants made, a list of eighteen where the congregation is either very small, or rapidly dwindling away, had been made. The result of these proceedings on the part of the sub-committee did not seem to have been productive of any noticeable results, and Mr Wilson, on behalf of the General Assembly, now proposed the appointment of a Special Commission to deal with the cases and report.

Mr M'ICKING, elder, seconded.

In the course of some conversation, Mr Sawers, Gargunnoch, and Dr Longmuir objected to entrusting powers to a commission for doing what rather lay with the Presbyteries.

Dr LONGMUIR said that three years ago he had opposed the appointment of a similar commission, as it presupposed that the smaller congregations were not doing their duty, or, as a learned member of the House had offensively said, that the ministers of non-self-sustaining congregations had "mistaken their trade." He (Dr L.) asserted on the contrary that the poorer congregations were doing their duty, and that it was the larger congregations that required to be visited, in which multitudes of non-contributors sheltered themselves under the wings of the wealthier members. He also opposed the appointment of this commission on the ground that it superseded the functions of Presbyteries. (Hear, hear.)

The following motion was ultimately agreed to:—"The General Assembly approve of the Report, and, in accordance therewith, resolve to appoint a Special Commission to deal with the Congregations referred to in the Report, and remit to the Committee to report to a future diet of this Assembly as to the names of the Commission, and the powers and instructions to be given to them."

SPECIAL REPORTS ANENT SCHEDULES AND SUPPLEMENTS.

Mr WILSON then submitted the report with regard to schedules passing the committee during the last ten years for the moderation of

calls. During the ten years from May 1855 to May 1865, 283 congregations passed the committee on schedules transmitted by Presbyteries. Of these 234 are on the platform of the equal dividend, and 49 are church extension charges. Of the former, 140 implemented or exceeded the amount promised, the amount of excess last year being £3421, 19s. 1d.; and 82 fell short of the sum promised or agreed to by the committee by the sum of £1460, 12s. 8d. for last year. These latter had all been communicated with, but the replies received, with very few exceptions, did not seem to justify the position which these congregations occupy. On this report the committee did not ask any action to be taken. With respect to supplements to ministers the sub-committee on that subject reported that, having investigated every congregation in the Free Church, there is not one of them where they can say that there is anything approaching to a high ministerial income; on the contrary, there is a lamentable number of cases where the income of the minister is wholly inadequate, and where it appears to the sub-committee that the congregations are abundantly able and ought to give their ministers a much larger supplement than they give at present. The sub-committee presented detailed information bearing upon this subject.

The two reports were received.

An overture anent supplements, from the Presbytery of Kincardine O'Neil, was then read, but there being nobody present to support it, was passed from.

EVENING SEDERUNT.

The Assembly met at seven o'clock,—Dr Roxburgh, Moderator.

REPORT OF EDUCATION COMMITTEE.

Mr NIXON, in laying on the table the report of the Education Committee, (No. 2,) said,—It will be seen from the business paper to-day, that I have given notice of a motion to propose a set of resolutions on the subject of education, and this business will come up after the report has been given in and disposed of by the Assembly. I have now to mention, with regard to our income, that it is £145 beyond what it was last year. (Applause.) We may be said merely to have turned the penny, which I think something wonderful, considering the adverse circumstances with which this scheme has hitherto had to contend. We were able at last Martinmas, for the first time since the Free Church came into existence, to pay the half-year's salaries to the teachers in full, and we are fortunately able to pay the salaries in full this term also. (Renewed applause.) To go on doing this, however, will require a decided increase in the ordinary income of the scheme; and if we cannot be instrumental in awakening a greater amount of liberality during the half-year that has now commenced, we shall have to stop this pleasant work of paying the salaries in full at Martinmas next. We have some hope, if the Assembly see their way to an enlightened and decided deliverance with regard to this whole matter of education, that the crisis through which we are now passing will prove the turning-point in the history of the scheme, and that whereas hitherto it has been borne down by adverse circumstances, we may find that it has reached the lowest point of depression, and, with ordinary and proper attention to

its interests, it may begin to ascend. That will depend, in a great measure, on the decision to which the Assembly shall come before the proceedings terminate. I may also mention that we have voted during last year fifteen grants to fifteen new schools. These are almost exclusively missionary schools in destitute districts of large towns, or congregational and district schools in necessitous and neglected country districts. There is one fact I have to state, namely, that the collection kindly authorised by the last General Assembly in aid of the Normal Schools realised £1426, of which £1313 have been applied to the Glasgow Normal School, and £113 to the Edinburgh school. Notwithstanding the earnest desires and efforts of the committee to keep out of debt in every department of expenditure, obligations of a serious nature have been, and are being, incurred by the Glasgow Normal School, which the half collection granted by the General Assembly last year has only partially discharged. Obligations of a slighter nature are also being incurred by the Normal School in Edinburgh. These liabilities require to be dealt with and met without delay. I hope some of our friends in Glasgow will be able to give us some indication of what may be done by the Assembly to deliver us from this burden. We have already endeavoured to get more favourable terms from the Government with reference to what is now doing under the Revised Code in Normal seminaries. We have a peculiar claim on the Government, for, as one of the officials told me—and everybody knows it to be a fact—our Normal Schools, and especially the one in the capital, as regards economy in management, stands the highest of any in the United Kingdom. (Applause.) We have a high character with the Government, and I believe if anything can be done for us, we will be as likely to prevail with the Government as any other party, though I must confess that I have no very sanguine hopes from that quarter, and I believe in all likelihood the Church itself will have to find out the ways and means of extinguishing this debt, and providing for the excess of expenditure over income to which we must be liable in future years. The only other thing I have to do is to give the gratifying intelligence presented by the statistics of examination of schools by Her Majesty's Inspectors under the Revised Code, for the year from 1st September 1865 to 31st August 1866. Our Free Church schools, as before, stand at the head of all the schools throughout the United Kingdom. (Cheers.) In regard to Scotland, the first table refers to the average attendance and the number who presented themselves for examination. The average attendance during the year in the Established Church schools, including the whole parish schools, was 101,903; Free Church, 49,132; Episcopal, 7686; Roman Catholics, 7572. Of the 101,903 at the Established Church Schools, 60,838 presented themselves for examination; of the Free Church, 28,827; Episcopal, 3837, and Roman Catholic, 4132. The second table shows the percentage of those presented for examination under each of the six standards, from which it appears that under the three higher standards the percentage in Free Church Schools was 27·20; in Established Church Schools, 25·81; in Episcopal Schools, 25·47; and in Roman Catholic Schools, 18·25. In England, the percentage presented for examination under the three higher standards was in British, Wesleyan, and other schools not connected with the Church of England, 25·69; in the Church of England Schools, 24·04; and in

Roman Catholic Schools, 17·92. Of the number of children examined the percentage that failed to pass was as follows, viz. :—

	Reading.	Writing.	Arithmetic.
Free Church schools,	2·95	9·21	17·17
Established Church do.,	6·32	16·42	23·36
Episcopal do.,	9·72	11·31	20·12
Roman Catholic do.,	8·42	6·82	19·

The schools, therefore, stood in the following order of merit, viz. :—Reading—Free Church, Established Church, Roman Catholic, and Episcopal; writing—Roman Catholic, Free Church, Episcopal, and Established Church; and arithmetic—Free Church, Roman Catholic, Episcopal, and Established Church. The order in which the schools stood may be stated in another way, viz. :—The percentage that passed completely—*i.e.*, in all the subjects (reading, writing, and arithmetic)—was, in Free Church schools, 76·93; in Roman Catholic schools, 73·76; in Episcopal schools, 68·75; and in Established Church schools, 66·56. In England, the percentage that passed completely was, in British and Wesleyan schools, &c., 68·35; in Roman Catholic schools, 65·04; and in Church of England schools, 63·11. The Free Church schools thus held the highest place last year, as they did in the year preceding. (Applause.) I cannot account for the comparatively high position which the Roman Catholic schools have taken. The explanation may partly be found in the fact mentioned on the preceding page, that the percentage of scholars presented for examination in the three higher standards was in these schools considerably less than other schools. “The order in which the schools in Scotland stood for the year 1864–65 was—Free Church, Episcopal, Established Church, and Roman Catholic—the difference between the two last being exceedingly small. For the past year the Established Church schools are unmistakably at the foot of the list. In the sixth or highest standard, the percentage of failures was—

<i>Scotland.</i>	Reading.	Writing.	Arithmetic.
Free Church Schools, .	1·26	8·19	11·26
Established Church do.	5·15	13·84	16·01
Episcopal do.	5·19	11·60	32·46
Roman Catholic do.	3·57	—	28·57
<i>England.</i>			
Church of England Schools,	4·95	13·50	26·49
Wesleyan, &c., do	4·74	9·12	21·94
Roman Catholic do.	4·75	16·47	31·96

There were only 28 children presented under Standard VI. in Roman Catholic schools in Scotland; and they can scarcely, therefore, be brought into fair comparison with other schools. The returns for 1864–65 showed that in reading the percentage of failures was greater in English than in Scotch schools, while in writing and arithmetic, the percentage of failures was considerably greater in Scotland than in England. For the past year the Scotch schools more than maintain their superiority in reading, they beat the English schools in arithmetic, and they are almost equal in writing—the difference being only 0·02 per cent. The improvement in Scotch schools during the past year is, indeed, very marked. For example, in Free Church schools, the percentage of failures in reading has fallen from 4·5 (in 1864–65) to 2·95; in writing, from 14·7 to 9·21;

and in arithmetic, from 22·8 to 17·17. There are those who will not believe in the accuracy of my report of these returns. I was accused, last year, by various periodicals of the Established Church with having, by deceptive statistics, obtained an unwarrantably favourable impression on behalf of our schools. Well, these are the Government statistics, carefully analysed by Mr Thomson, whose accuracy all who know him will admit. But if these statistics are not admitted by our friends outside, it may help to compel them to admit the accuracy of the report that the assistant-commissioners of the Royal Commissioners, found, apparently to their own surprise, as the result of their examination of a proportionate number of Free Church and parish schools, that the teaching in the Free Church schools is more efficient than the teaching in the parish schools in the ratio of 86 to 80 per cent. They couple this discovery indeed by a caution in their words "if our estimates are correct," and try to balance their estimate by setting over against it the fact which everybody knows, and which our analysis brings out, viz., that a few boys in parish schools are more advanced than any in Free Church schools. And there is something like an insinuation in the report of the Commissioners (page 97) that some inspectors are more lenient than others. On the contrary, we have great reason to find fault with them for overstringency. My experience is, that whenever you get into the hands of a Government official of the Free Church, you meet with an amount of severity you meet nowhere else. (Hear, hear.) But were this the case in the Free Church schools, the results of the examinations in writing and arithmetic in the three higher standards—which are judged in London—would be more unfavourable than those in the lower standards, which are decided simply by the inspector himself. But the superiority of the Free Church schools in these higher standards is even more marked than it is in the lower ones. Again, as if they were somewhat anxious to take away the argument for the continuance of our schools derived from their superior efficiency, these Commissioners somewhat ultroneously, I should think, as well as in the teeth of the declarations of our leading ministers in their evidence before the Commissioners, take upon them to announce that our schools are become or becoming an unsupportable burden on our Church resources and strength. (Laughter.) To prove this, they state that in the five years (1860 to 1865) our schools had dwindled down from 621 to 570, and our scholars from 62,400 to 61,000—that is, we had at the end of that period 51 fewer schools and 1300 fewer scholars. But it so happens that in 1866 we had 578 schools and 63,127 scholars, and in 1867 we have 595 schools and 64,050 scholars; so that while the number of schools is rather less than in 1860, those that have been discontinued are small schools, and those that have been commenced are of a larger size and a higher class; and there are now 1550 more scholars in attendance at our schools than there were in 1860. (Applause.) Mr Nixon concluded by saying—I will not enter further into the report, because, after the Assembly have approved of it, I will take the liberty of moving a set of resolutions. I am very glad to be able to announce from Dr Thomas Smith, who undertook to be convener of the committee, to raise a sum to meet the crying wants of the old Disruption teachers, that Dr Smith has obtained £100 already, which will be distributed in small sums to the most necessitous of those good men; and he expects to be able to distribute a similar sum

in a short time—in the course of a few months. And I am also glad to find that the Teachers' Association are taking steps in the same direction. So that, if we get our affairs at all disentangled, I have not the slightest doubt that the sympathy and support of the friends of the Church will not be wanting to those deserving servants of the Church. (Applause.)

Mr MILLER, of Leithen, said he had very great pleasure in moving the adoption of this most satisfactory report, which had been laid before the Assembly by their esteemed father, Mr Nixon. It was peculiarly gratifying to find the high position which the schools had attained throughout the whole country as compared with other schools, either in England or Scotland; and he thought that if there was ever a time when it was of the utmost importance that their schools should stand in a high position it was now, so that they might be able to show that so independent a body as the Free Church could conduct her schools in such a highly satisfactory way as had been shown to them that evening. (Applause.) He would not, however, take up the time of the Assembly on that subject at present, as it would come up afterwards for consideration. Meanwhile, he would move the approval of the report, and that they record their thanks to their esteemed father, the convener, for the energy and organising power which he had manifested in this most important branch of the work entrusted to the Free Church. (Applause.)

Mr MACKENZIE, of Dunfermline, seconded the motion, which was carried by acclamation.

THE ROYAL COMMISSIONERS' REPORT ON NATIONAL EDUCATION.

Mr NIXON then proceeded to propose the resolutions of which he had given notice on this subject. In doing so he said—Before proposing these resolutions I have to make a statement, if the Assembly will be pleased to indulge me with a little patience and forbearance, on a subject to which they have directed a vast deal less of their attention for many years than I think it is well entitled to. I shall not now attempt to state the causes of this, though I am quite prepared when occasion arises to state what I think they are. I shall merely observe that the facts themselves cannot be questioned. I hope the Assembly will acknowledge that it is high time for its mind to be more intently fixed on this great scheme of the Church than it has been for a number of years past; and I may say this, whether they intend to make this scheme what it ought to be, or whether they intend to give it a decent burial. (Laughter.) It is a miserable life a man is leading when daily expecting to be deprived of it, he knows not when the end is to be. I suppose that the days of a lingering existence of this sort are more miserable and painful than even the act of experiencing death itself. With these preliminary remarks, I beseech your attention. According to the recommendations and the draft bill embodying them, the parish schools are to have their name altered into that of old national schools, and to remain otherwise as they are, excepting that the teachers are to be henceforward under inspectors not necessarily belonging to the Established Church, and at the disposal of a general board; and that the heritors and parish ministers, or two-thirds of the parish board which they constitute, may hand them over to the parochial school committees

chosen under the direction of the sheriff, half by the landed proprietors, and the other half by the ratepayers, if such committees are willing to take them. As a temptation to this course, the heritors would save a little money, and lose or not lose, as the case might be, a little power; and the ratepayers, in return for the tax they laid henceforth on themselves, might gain in appearance, if not in reality, a little power; while, in such a position, the parish schools would come in for a larger share of the Parliamentary grants. In all districts where there are no schools of any kind, or schools of a character pronounced insufficient by State inspectors, new schools, called New National Schools, are to be raised by direct taxation of the inhabitants of the district, and under the general board, managed by local committees in rural parishes, chosen as already described, and by local committees in burghs, appointed by the town councils. Schools like ours, known by the misleading name, often somewhat opprobriously given to them, of denominational schools, would be received only individually, and to a greater or less extent, as the Central Board might be pleased to deem them needful and suitable, or otherwise. Such of them as were thus embraced in the general system, while placed also under the Central Board as "adopted schools," would continue for the present to be managed by us as in times past. But though they are still to share in the Parliamentary grants, and though we surely pay a sufficient price for retaining their management, in the voluntary contributions by which we sustain them, we are to pay a further price for this power by being deprived of all share of the local rates raised for the other "national schools." Other disadvantages to be inflicted on us are, that none of our schools shall be taken as "adopted schools," except they are deemed by the Board necessary and efficient; no further aid shall be allowed to us to build new ones; and none of those we build hereafter shall be adopted at all, unless such as we erect within two years after the passing of the bill. There are to be examiners chosen by the universities to certify the competency of teachers. And the Board that is placed over the whole scheme (consisting of four persons chosen by the Universities, the four Provosts of Edinburgh, Glasgow, Dundee, and Aberdeen; three gentlemen chosen by the three counties of Ayr, Inverness, and Perth; and four appointed by the Crown, one of them as the paid chairman) is to have very great and summary power of establishing schools whenever it deems them required, and of disposing of all teachers of the old and new national schools. Before adverting to the character of the measure recommended by the Royal Commission—its manifest design, its probable workings, the position in which it places us as a Church, and our duty in the circumstances—I may mention here that the facts brought out, and recorded in the volumes of reports just published, will serve to silence for ever most of the arguments for national education that for so many years were so eloquently declaimed upon by our most popular orators from every public platform. Thus the argument from the alleged educational destitution of the country must be to a great extent given up, for it is but a fraction of what it was represented to be, and is found chiefly in a few large cities, in insular regions, and in the remoter and more sparsely-peopled districts of Highland parishes. And, altogether, it turns out that about as large a proportion are at school in Scotland as in the best provided for of the United States. Again, the argument from the

deficiency in the quality of the education furnished, must also, to a considerable extent be given up. For, with the exception of the wretched concerns in the shape of schools, found in the lowest, and, of course, often Roman Catholic districts of Glasgow and Dundee, and in such out-of-the-way sparse and poor populations, as it will be difficult for any system; and especially for any Government system, without an enormously disproportionate expenditure of money, to reach; with such exceptions, the deficiency lies more in the want of proper school accommodation than in the elementary teaching itself. The deficiency, moreover, is so continually lessening, and the quality of the teaching is so improving of late, that, had we only for a time the benefit of the Revised Code, with the improvements suggested upon it, for Scotland, and were a simple central authority established, that was empowered, on reports of district Government inspectors, to set up, even by means of existing Poor Boards, or other authorised local committees, new schools wherever not otherwise provided, no time need elapse before having a sufficient elementary provision made for the common school education of all the population in the land. Of course, too, we shall hear no more of that stock argument of our famous men, with which they were wont to wring tears from the eyes not only of sentimental ladies, but of other weeping patriots—(laughter)—viz., that the present system was introducing the very spirit of all strife into the hearts of the tender little ones, who otherwise might be brought up in happy ignorance of the divisions of the visible Church, locked daily in each other embraces, and destined when they grew up to manifest a perfect freedom from the bitterness that filled their fathers before them. (Renewed laughter.) For what some of us constantly affirmed without being listened to is now made, plain—viz., that the pictures publicly paraded on this subject were, as regards the general actual state of matters, pure fancy sketches, without the slightest foundation in fact. The way in which the children of all the denominations in the country attend the schools in connexion with either of them, has served to bring out that no schools can be created or imagined, more truly national in their spirit and their teaching, than such as we have provided and maintain.

In proceeding to deal with the character of the scheme proposed, it is indispensable that I solicit the attention of the Assembly to two distinct theories of education, and then to show, as plainly as I can, under which of these theories I believe this scheme must be ranked. The theories, no doubt, when in actual operation, overlap and run into each other. But they are sufficiently distinct in their principles and workings to be contemplated apart.

The first of these theories is what I called the scriptural one.

This theory deals with the young as reasonable and immortal creatures. It has a proper regard to all their relations and interests. It deals with them chiefly, in their relation to God and eternity, and, subordinately, in their relation to the present world. It labours to train all the faculties of their nature, soul, body, and spirit. And, treating them as sinful creatures, it has, for its main object, to lead them to Christ, for their personal salvation. At the same time, it labours to furnish them, to the utmost possible extent, with all useful knowledge, so as to fit them most effectually for serving Christ on earth, and then going to serve Him for ever in a better world. Is that the theory of edu-

cation propounded by this Royal Commission? Is it? Is it not the theory that is studiously ignored? If this scheme is carried out, will any one venture to stand up in this Assembly, and affirm that we may trust to it for the vital evangelisation of the young?

Does any one ask of me the grounds on which we ought to make so much of daily education as the means of the christianisation of the young? The grounds are broad, solid, and enduring.

In all ages, under the old as well as the new dispensation, the Church has recognised the divine obligation laid on her, by such an education, to cultivate the whole nature, and further the highest as well as all other interests, of the young.

The Jewish youth were taught God's statutes and ordinances continually. As Dr Arnold says, they were taught, not only their national history, but the will of God regarding them morally and politically; His will with regard to all the private and public relations of life; with regard to their government, their limits and divisions, their property, real and personal; their rules of inheritance; their rules with regard to marriage; their whole conduct, in short, in peace and war, as men, as citizens.

Not less is it divinely required, under the gospel, to train the young so that they may learn to glorify God in every way, in their varied callings and circumstances, and with all their faculties and powers, outward and inward.

The duty thus to train them is involved in the commission given by Christ to His servants, to "go and teach," or make disciples of, "all nations," that is, to bring them into Christ's school or Church; to "baptize" them, that is, to dedicate them wholly and unreservedly to God; and then, "to teach them all things, whatsoever Christ has commanded;" to instruct them in their duty to God, to their families, to the Church, and to the world. The Church, in reference to their baptismal engagements, undertakes to see them performed; and, in reference to the general commission, undertakes to see it carried out to the utmost extent of her power, by using every kind of education which she can control, for the christianising of old and young.

The Church of God is the only community on earth that has, through all ages, endeavoured thus to train the young. It is a modern event, to find civil governments, as such, attempting to provide for the education of all the youth of a land.

In the earlier ages of the Christian era, the Church had its "doctor" or teacher, as well as pastor, connected with each congregation, the former having it for his special work to educate the young in all desirable knowledge. The Waldensian Church, that notable witness for the truth amidst the darkness of bygone ages, was kept from the apostasy of other churches, very much by its constant laborious care to educate, in all attainable sanctified knowledge, each rising generation. The churches of the Reformation were distinguished for their schools and colleges, as the means by which they trained their members to bear aloft the banner of the truth. And certainly, one of the highest characteristics of the Scottish Church, and a principal source of whatever intelligence and virtue have been found in our Presbyterian population, was the system of common and higher schools, which Knox planned, and his successors in the ministry have been the main instruments of upholding, so far as it has

been upheld, till now. "The godly upbringing of the youth of this realm," by means of the "profitable knowledge and erudition" given to them, in schools, was declared to be their great design.

The system we are now describing, setting before it as its grand design, the really Christian training of the young in schools, and making its regulations accordingly, may be called the scriptural system on the following grounds :—(1.) The Scriptures furnish the great truths with which, above all things, it labours to acquaint the young. (2.) The authority of God speaking in His Word is employed as of paramount importance, in subduing the wayward spirit of the young, and in impressing on teachers and taught the duty and the design of the proper cultivation of all the powers and faculties of the soul. (3.) The system requires stated times to be set apart for prayer, and for the formal instruction of the young in the truths and precepts of the Bible. (4.) The whole work of education is so conducted as to have the spirit of the gospel pervading the entire teaching, training, and discipline of the school. (5.) For such work, it is indispensable that teachers of Christian character be sought out ; that their preparation and training for their work be conducted on Christian principles ; and that in the performance of their duty they be superintended by Christian men. (6.) The chief oversight of such educational work provided by God is that of His Church, as the pillar and ground of the truth.

It is among other Christian appliances, by her effective care for the thorough Christian education of the young, that the Church is to fulfil her commission, to make disciples of all nations. As is remarked by Dr Houston, whose remarks on Christian education have guided us very much in what we have just stated, the world will never thus educate the young—worldly statesmen and teachers, who receive their inspiration from worldly statesmen, though they may impart to them much useful knowledge, will not thus educate the young. The Church that abandons this work, is sinking into lukewarmness. A revived and living earnest Church, in striving to place and keep her members under the power of true religion, will labour to have the whole education of her young conducted in a Christian manner, and thus prove the nursing mother of a holy seed. She will charge herself with authoritatively securing this kind of education for her youth in all stations of life, but especially for the poorer portion of them. She will thus endeavour to foster in them that fear of the Lord which is the beginning of wisdom ; and instead of the fathers, to rear up the children that they may become princes in all the earth.

The second of the theories referred to at the outset may be called the secular one.

It undertakes, as its principal end, to educate the young for the duties of the present life. Their higher interests are left very much to parents and ministers, to be attended to in the main, apart from their common school education. Not that religion is *necessarily* excluded from school. Instruction in it may be part of the ordinary work. And an earnest teacher may not be actually prevented from seriously dealing with the young for their salvation. But the furtherance of their highest interests is not contemplated as a *formal stated* object of the operations of such a system. Its *main* object is to teach them to read, and write, and cipher, and to impart *secular* knowledge suitable to their future earthly employ-

ments. The teaching of religion, when connected with such a system, is *habitually* a subordinate, lifeless work.

We have had no general system in this country, founded on this basis hitherto. It has been hitherto unknown in the Church of God in any age. It was unknown even to the heathen world, a large portion of any teaching known in its having respect to their gods.

The two countries in which it has been tried are Prussia and America. Permit me to give a short statement of facts about that kind of education in these two countries, before I allude shortly to the proposal to establish a somewhat similar system in Scotland. The design of the statement is to show that it has not provided education in these countries that is either universal in extent or sufficient in quality, and that it has not operated as our own system has done for the religious, moral, and social well-being of the population.

As to Prussia, the following summary of applicable facts is taken from a pamphlet on "Prussian Primary Education," by Principal Unwin of Homerton College. It might have been expected that a system planned and wielded by such a government as that of Prussia, would have at least brought all the people under training, and given them something like an effective mechanical education at any rate. And yet, in 1851-52, that is, above thirty years after their system of training, with the aid of its somewhat famous normal schools, had been in operation, according to the militia returns, ament the education of all classes reported on, for the nine provinces of Prussia, Posen, Brandenburg, &c. In the first of these provinces, that of Prussia, 10 per cent. had grown up without any education at all, 45 per cent. had only a defective education, and only the remaining 44 per cent. had an education pronounced satisfactory.

Then, as to the moral and religious and social results, Mr Joseph Kay, in his work on "The Social Condition and Education of the People of England and Europe," is pleased to praise "the results, as seen in the character and condition of the peasantry," as "magnificent." But Dr Wiese, in his "German Letters on English Education," says, "Mr Kay is too hasty in drawing an universal conclusion from a particular case, and his praises refer to an *ideal* which is far from being realised." Mr Laing, in his "Notes of a Traveller," while admitting that reading and writing are widely diffused, at the same time declares that "the people are not moral, nor religious, nor enlightened, nor free, nor of educated mind, in any true sense." This judgment of Mr Laing agrees with that of the Prussian authorities themselves. For, in a work on "The Constitution and Plan of a Parish School," published in Berlin in 1850, under the *sanction of the Minister of Public Instruction*, it is proclaimed that the system "did nothing for the development of the moral life of the people." And, in 1854, the Prussian government itself declared officially that the system had "proved to be inefficacious and injurious."

You will not wonder at this if you attend to what I have now to state. When Prussia, in her educational movement, abandoned the old scriptural theory that in all the countries of the Reformation had been embodied in public education, she took the lead in what is called "the enlightened age," in introducing the "useful-knowledge" theory which deals with education as to be *chiefly*, and alone, *formally* employed in training the young in such secular knowledge as may fit them for the duties of the present life.

But when men abandon the firm footing of God's own word, and act on maxims of mere human wisdom, there is no saying where they will even quickly land themselves. And so in Prussia, as in other continental lands, the advocates and agents of education, having adopted and put in operation this useful knowledge theory of education, came to find that it was a hopeless, impracticable task to make school time the season, and the school the instrument, for cramming youth with the needful amount of useful knowledge. And therefore they next determined that the proper business of education was to teach the young to exert their thinking powers, and without instilling into them fixed opinions on any subject whatever, to send them forth with the faculty for gathering knowledge, and making what use of it they thought best. It is needless to add that the advocates of this theory came out as pantheists and infidels, or, if possible, something worse.

Accordingly, as we are told in the work, "*De l'Education Populaire dans l'Allemagne du Nord*," &c., par E. Rendu, (p. 34,) Dr Diesterweg, who was at the head of the great training college in Berlin, used these words, "We hold Church doctrines to be decrepit, the teaching of the Church to be petrified. In nothing does she any longer respond to the life of the age. True religion consists in this, to recognise the existence of a spiritual force, of an intelligence, a reason in the universe, as the basis of all being, and of all phenomena; to believe in this spirit as the durable element in all that perishes, the unchangeable element in all that changes. As to the name by which you call this spirit, that matters little." These were the words of a man who in his day trained a vast proportion of the teachers in the Prussian primary schools. His creed was at least as wide as that of Basedon, who also in his time exerted immense influence on educational theories in Germany, and who said of his celebrated establishment, that "in it nought should transpire in word or deed, which could offend the scruples of any worshipper of God, be he Christian, Jew, Mohammedan, or Deist."

And what of the common school teachers, trained by such a head master? Mr Rendu gives a specimen of one, whose school he entered in Hanover, who was, he says, intelligent, educated, and of quick and ready mind, and who at length gave this confession of his faith, "I respect Christ, but I assign him his proper place. As to God, I say to my pupils, with Goethe—

' Who dares name Him?
And who confess,
I believe in Him?
Whose the hardihood to say,
In Him believe I not?'

Oh the remark being made, your orthodoxy is not very extravagant, he replied, "No; yet it is the orthodoxy of our schools; for we Protestants teach religious instruction quite free. As for me, I go to church because I am sacristan. But my duties are light; two hours on Sunday, one on the week days, that is all. I have read Strauss, and a little of Feuerbach, and belong to the religion of Pastor Uhlich. As to the authorities, I know how I must appear to them at present, when they are about to appoint a Pietest as the principal of our Trinity College. These are phases of orthodoxy. But patience; my brother schoolmasters know as well as I that all this is but a transitory stage."

Was that a singular case? Let the question be answered in the words

of the official document issued by the Consistory of the Province of Brandenburg, Prussia, on the 4th of January 1852:—"It is very sad to think that among teachers, contrary to their duty and the principal end of their mission, which is to train the young to piety, some never frequent divine service; others only attend irregularly; that they never partake of the holy communion; and that instead of being, as they ought to be, salutary examples in their several parishes, they give the pernicious example of contempt for sacred practices and Christian customs."

There is surely no cause for wondering when we find that sort of training of the population at length yielding its proper fruits, in the eventful year of 1848, in the outbursts of that revolutionary frenzy that then swept over the Continent, and that threatened, for a time, to lay its thrones in the dust. That terrible uprising of the people of Germany revealed the scepticism of the upper ranks, and the atheism among the masses, to which they had been trained, and formed a striking commentary on the character of the education that Prussia had been giving to her people.

The government and its friends now found it needful to try, in their own fashion, to bring God down again into the hearts of the people. And what did they do? They at once declared, by their acts, that they saw the grand cause of this depraved condition of the people, in the kind of educational system which they had been making such a boast of keeping in full operation for many years. The clergy were instructed to take more interest in the local schools. Dr Diesterweg, the Pantheist, was removed from the training school in Berlin. His successor, (the Pietist referred to in the words of the teacher in Hanover, already quoted,) proclaimed it the business of education to develop the child's faculties for the good of the Church and for the good of the country. Then, on the three first days of October 1854, the government issued three successive orders, which, in some respects, radically changed the character of Prussian education by the way in which these orders henceforth regulated the training schools, the studies of those preparing to enter them, and the constitution of the primary or common schools throughout the country. By the stern authority of government, religion and education were ordered again to be united, the subjects, class-books, and modes of education, both in the training seminaries and the common schools, all were prescribed, and all freedom of opinion and practice were forbidden to teachers. The government rules excluded universal history from the schools, and substituted patriotic souvenirs, national institutions, distinguished Prussians, dead and living, and loyalty to the existing royal family, as subjects with which to occupy and train those who were to become teachers. The same rules shut out ecclesiastical history, German grammar as a science, geography, except in connection with Bible and German history. The rules went further, and actually prescribed the books to be used in the private studies of those who were being trained to teach; excluding from the list given all their great leading poets, philosophers, historians, and men of science.

But all these changes have not, as I think, essentially altered its character. It is the same useful knowledge theory still; it is still a system mainly directed to fit the subjects of its operations for being submissive subjects of earthly government. No doubt, God and eternity are taken in among the instrumentalities. But they are so on the same footing on which other subjects of useful knowledge are patronised—viz.

their subserviency to the temporal political ends contemplated; and though, in individual cases, the knowledge thus communicated may be, through sovereign grace, the means of awakening higher thoughts, and kindling holier aspirations, than such as are alone formally contemplated by the system itself; still, in its essence and its tendencies, it remains a secular system after all. And if we may judge of its character by its effects in the capital of the country after it has again, above a dozen of years, operated in its last modified form, the results do not say much for it, and give us little encouragement to adopt any similar educational policy; for, not to mention other things which show the sad condition of Berlin, with its population of 600,000, it has in all but thirty-six churches and chapels—that is, one for about every 17,000 of the inhabitants, with two services on Sabbath in only thirteen of these thirty-six, and with a considerable number of even the thirty-six places of worship, in which worship is conducted, without worshippers.

These results of the Prussiau system, so utterly and so instructively different from those anticipated and alleged, might well suffice to make us abide by our connexion of Church-and-school system of education, that we may still rear, on Christian principles, worthy citizens of a free country, worthy members of freer churches, and fitting heirs of the land of glorious light and liberty for ever. But if we will go after these idols of other nations which we have set up in our hearts, and will have them planted in this land, then I fear a calamitous future is before our children. And only a baptism of suffering may suffice, if even it will then suffice, to open the eyes of the nation to the fatal results of our folly and sin, and to prompt a return to the old paths and the good way which we so madly abandoned.

We are, however, told to look to America, and see what national education is doing for the people there. I have no objection to let the actual state of things there decide the whole question.

From the Reports for Massachusetts and the city of Boston in 1860, and subsequently, I glean such facts as the following. In 1862, of the whole population in that State, about one-seventh were enrolled at the schools; that is about the same number as are attending school at present in Scotland. The schools numbered 4561; so that this gave under 40 to each school. But the actual attendance was less than that; and as there were a teacher and an assistant-teacher in each school, each had less than 20 under daily teaching. Then, of 10,565 teachers in the State, connected with these schools, only 1927 were males, the other 8638 were females. The whole period of each year, during which the schools were open, was, in some cases, as low as five months, in others as high as ten—the average term being eight months of the year. In the city of Boston again, containing a population of about 200,000, besides three High Schools, the Latin—the High English—and the Girls', and Normal Schools—the city being divided into twenty districts, there is a grammar school in each district, and a proper complement of primary schools. The teachers in the city number 547, of which 67 are males, and 480 females. The teachers are thus divided:—There are in the High School 7 male teachers; in the English High School, 5 male teachers; in the Girl's High and Normal School, 1 male and 10 female teachers; in the 20 grammar schools, 42 male and 213 female teachers; and in the primary schools, 250 female teachers. A few of the whole teachers in the city are employed in other than regular class instruc-

tion. The largest number assigned to a teacher is 56. The law compels attendance of the young, between 8 and 14 years, only for 12 weeks in the year, with 6 of these weeks continuous. The schools, while they are to be provided in sufficient number, do not require to be kept open for longer than six months of the year. In every school of 50 scholars there must be an assistant-teacher. While a portion of Scripture is to be daily read, there must be no explanation of it. And the only exercise of prayer permitted is the repetition of the Lord's Prayer daily. No lessons can be assigned to girls to be learned out of school hours, no lessons can be thus assigned to boys, beyond what a boy of average capacity can learn in one hour. The teachers are chosen annually. Before the time of election each year the committee meets and runs over the list of teachers, and decides which of them shall be again engaged or dropped for the year ensuing. And they can be summarily dismissed at any time during the currency of the year.

These facts suggest at once to every thinking mind a number of very salutary reflections, applicable to the subject before us. But time forbids me so much as to mention them further than to say that, while there is not a larger proportion of the population at school in that favoured State of Massachusetts than we have in Scotland, though we have no city in which there is the same complement of schools as in Boston, still with the unspeakably more effectual training that we give in secular branches, and the infinitely higher freedom, fulness, and strength of our religious teaching, I for one would prefer immeasurably the system we have, with even its present results, to that of Boston with its results, especially when we know that if mere talkers would but be silent, and hinderers would get out of the way, and half of those on whom the duty lies, would but aid with half the help they are bound to render, we could in no time, without any of their revolutionary and ruinous movements and menaces, extend our means of education, so as to meet, with an efficient as well as sufficiently extended education, the wants of the people.

But what signifies any amount of education if its quality is deteriorated and its effects pernicious? And what are the literally, religious, moral, and social results among the people of America? Let two of their own authoritative organs of opinion answer the question. The following extracts speak for themselves.

We give first an extract from the *North American Review* for July 1866, of a criticism on a pamphlet published in Philadelphia, on "The Daily Public School in the United States." "This careful-looking pamphlet is devoted to an exposure of the shortcomings of our system of common schools. It is based on an analysis of the system as it exists in four leading States, Ohio, Pennsylvania, New York, and Massachusetts. . . . It is evidently the work of a man of sense, candour, and considerable experience, and his opinions are the better worth listening to because they are quite opposite to the prevailing opinions. There is perhaps no covert or fastness from which it would be more difficult to dislodge the American peacock than the common school. Here he expands and suns himself secure in the admiration of the civilized world, and accepts, as his due, the tribute offered to his superiority by the envy of crowned heads, and the applause of the aristocratic scoffers of Europe. . . . "It is our firm belief," says our author, "that the confidence reposed in our present common school system is delusive, and that while specific branches of knowledge have advanced in later years, and some spheres of education have been greatly

widened and improved, the work of preparing the great body of the school children of the country for the duties and responsibilities of life is very imperfectly done." There is, indeed, some difficulty in fixing a standard. To determine, for instance, how many persons in a given district can read and write is, as our author remarks, as hard to determine as how many of them are well off. The standard which he proposes cannot certainly be called an unreasonable one. He would only require that "every individual between five and twenty-one may have the opportunity to be *well taught* in reading, spelling, writing, grammar, geography, and arithmetic;" but he says, "In the course of fifty years pretty close observation of a great variety of men and women of divers temperament, social relation, capacities, and pursuits, we have scarcely found one in a thousand that could spell, read, write, or speak their mother tongue with propriety;" and his observation of many thousands of children and youth has satisfied him that "nine in ten of them are incompetent to read properly a paragraph in the newspapers, to keep a single debt-and-credit account in a mechanic's shop, or to write an ordinary business letter in a creditable way." And it is from a Massachusetts teacher too that he cites the remark that "the culpable neglect of the New England schools in teaching their pupils how to write a letter is proved a hundred times every year in the letters we receive. Men and women in respectable situations write us letters which disgracefully abound with false grammar, bad spelling, and worse punctuation." These are not cheerful pictures, nor does our author encourage us to believe that matters are substantially improving. He is "by no means prepared to admit that the schools of to-day make better readers, spellers, and writers, than were made by the schools forty or fifty years ago. Then, what was wanting in facilities was largely made up in application and painstaking. The young mind was not distracted with a score of different studies. Nobody dreamed that rhetoric and philosophy, political economy and constitutional law, had a place in the daily common school." The system must be judged by its fruits, and, moreover, relatively to the general development and progress; if the schools are not better, they are worse; the "arts and sciences have advanced marvellously, but whether the people more justly appreciate their social and civil privileges, whether the virtues of honesty, industry, temperance, and reverence for the authority of God or man, are as conspicuous now in the mass of the community as they were then, is very questionable." . . . "There is some truth in the notion that the cheerful view is the distant one, and, in general, those who see the schools near at hand without any professional or disturbing bias are the least satisfied. Those who see them at a distance see a good deal of show and bustle, and they are ready to conclude that the high average of intelligence and cultivation which they see, and which, no doubt, is highest where the schools are best, is the direct product of the schools. The opposite view is, the wonder that schools in the midst of so intelligent a people, and completely subject to their control, should be so lifeless, so little in earnest, or discriminating as to what is taught, or the way in which it is taught. And an uncomfortable suspicion sometimes intrudes itself, that the stir and noise, the imposing array of academies, lyceums, colleges with their programmes, their diplomas, and their professorships, may be due to a very different spirit from that which moved in the original conception of the New England schools,—that the glory of that

conception is in danger of being counterfeited for the behoof of something of a very different nature,—and a doubt whether the real demand is not in many cases rather for something to be used as the badge of social distinction than for education.

“There is certainly no excess of political economy, philosophy, or even of rhetoric, that is, of the reality of these things in the community, but a great deal too much of a cheap and flashy show of them, a smattering of names and phrases with little thought of knowledge, but only a desire to be supposed to know, and to get thereby some credit or advantage, without any gain, but only to the obstruction of real enlightenment. And it may be well for us to ask ourselves whether something of this spirit might not be found even in the normal schools of which we in Massachusetts are so proud. . . . The normal school at Salem has been open ten years. The number of graduates from it alone is seven hundred and fifty-eight. Yet it appears that only about four per cent. of the teachers in the State have been under normal school instruction. What becomes of the rest of the graduates? . . . What anybody can see for himself in the villages and farmhouses is an increased number of young ladies of a dressy turn who read the magazines, and perhaps write in them—who often have delicate health, not often much capacity or taste for the primary duties of women. There is a marked increase in the number of candidates for any genteel employment that does not require much hard work, but not a very manifest advance in the application of trained intelligence to the arts of life. . . . There is no reason why the public should pay for gratifying this ambition and vanity, under the pretence of improving the schools in which the public are directly and generally interested.”

The defects of the school system our author considers to be directly traceable to neglect of the primary schools—in which alone nine-tenths of the people get all the education they have, and with which alone therefore the State has properly anything to do—in favour of the advanced or “graded” schools. These, he thinks, ought to be left to private enterprise. And certainly there is a manifest distinction between the two classes of schools as regards their claims to public support. “The community has a direct interest in giving to every one of its members so much elementary instruction as shall put within his reach the means of qualifying himself to discharge the duties of citizenship. . . . But when we come to special preparation for particular tasks or exceptional positions, the case is entirely changed. Here indiscriminateness is an absurdity; there ought to be special reasons for every step, and the danger from an indiscriminate and wholesale system is immense.”

This extract contains such statements of fact with reference to the literary and moral results of the American educational system as exhibit them upon the whole in a light, to say the least, not so favourable as that in which the Royal Commissioners and their agents have been constrained to speak of the existing results of our Scottish education.

But twenty years before this judgment was pronounced by evidently friendly censors upon the general literary and moral results of the national schools of America, the effects of their operation on the vital religion of the people were set forth in such terms as the following, in one of the ablest reports I ever read, presented to the General Assembly of the Old School Presbyterian Church in 1847. Among many other

similar statements it says :—"The general tendency of things in this country (America) is unquestionably to dishonour the religious element in the system of education under the patronage of the State. . . . A general system of education that shall be a *Christian* system, appears to be a *state-impracticability*. . . . The education of the country was once in a great degree under our own care; or at least we had the care of our own children. But the encroachments of a *false liberality* have so far banished *Presbyterian* and *evangelical* influence, that the education of our children is now mixed up with the politics of the State, and *knows nothing of the religion of the Church*. . . . It has become so *fashionable to be liberal*, that even select schools often dispense with *evangelical truth* in order to please all Christian denominations. . . . The *neglect of religious instruction in our schools* is doing more to nurture infidelity and immorality than ever was in the power of Voltaire and Paine. . . . Alas! how many children are common-schooled out of heaven! . . . The Free Church of Scotland, with a high remembrance of her ancestral privileges, has gone diligently to work in building schools as the defence of the gate of Zion. This policy, sanctioned by the Word of God, and commended by all experience, will, if adopted by our own Church, cause her to resume her ancient position, clear as the sun, fair as the moon, and terrible as an army with banners. . . . It is high time for the Presbyterian Church to fall back upon her glorious old landmarks; and what we cannot do for all, we must endeavour to do for ourselves in the matter of thorough Christian education. . . . The direction of our schools would be religious instead of political under the Church instead of the State. And this is the true plan. Religion and education are natural allies. The guardians of Christianity are *ex officio* the guardians of education. . . . Our Church has the example of the Free Church of Scotland to stimulate and encourage her in the prosecution of her educational measures."

This extract, in connexion with the date of the document from which it is taken, 1847, reminds us that the influence of a wrong system of National Education will first of all tell on the vital godliness of a people. The first extract I read, which refers to the state of things there some years later, reminds us, that while an objectionable educational system will first tell most palpably on the interests of vital religion, the system will not less certainly operate to take the virtue out of even secular training. And I have now to show how, by the same system, the whole social state of a people is ultimately affected to its very core. We are not, with these extracts in our possession, to have repeated here without sufficient authority that off-hand eulogium of the schools of America, and of the state of society there by which it is attempted to throw us off our guard. Instead of being enticed by the praises poured forth in favour of education in America by those who really knew very little about it, its actual state, and the moral gangrene which it is permitting or helping to eat into the whole moral nature and habits of so many of that people, it ought to make us tremble at, and resist to the uttermost, every proposal to place our whole education in the hands of similar local committees of citizens. This leads me (continued Mr Nixon) to notice shortly the painful and alarming fact that the measure for Scotland, now proposed, is of this secular character, and that we have no security that it will not prove as pernicious in its workings in this land as it has proved and is

proving both in Prussia and America. No doubt this draft bill and the recommendations on which it is founded contain some provisions which may be thought by some to point in a religious direction. But they do so only in appearance, not in reality. I say this, of course, with reference to the tendency of the bill, not the intentions of its framers. It allows the parish ministers, along with the heritors, still to retain in their hands the whole of the parish schools. But the parish ministers remain chiefly because the political influence which keeps them there is still too powerful to be mastered and overborne by the "Liberal" advocates of "national education." And though the latter are, I doubt not, calculating without their host when they reckon on ejecting the ministers by and by, and bringing even the parish schools under the proposed local committees, yet, that being their design and expectation, it is not a tribute to religion, but to necessity, that the parish ministers remain. Indeed, to suppose anything else, to suppose that they are kept in their place because they represent their Church and religion, while other Churches and their ministers are treated in the bill as they are, would be to suppose such a studied wrong offered to us, and the calls of the age, and the current of the whole legislation of the country, as none of the parties dealing with this question would offer on the one hand, or be expected to tolerate for a moment on the other. In such schools as ours, again, the management still is left in the hands of our Church and her office-bearers. But this is only for the time being. They are placed under a sentence of death. But the judges who have condemned them are afraid at once to put their sentence in execution. Therefore they place them for the present in prison and in chains, put them on stinted allowance, and expect that, in such circumstances, they will in due time die what will be pronounced a natural death, and so save the necessity and odium of a public hanging. For see the condition in which we will be placed by the passing of this measure. We no longer receive any Government aid to build new school premises or to repair existing ones. And as, of course, no system can prosper that does not continue advancing, thus to arrest our progress is to secure our decline. In all cases in which the civil authorities declare our present premises insufficient, unless we at once repair or rebuild them, also at our own expense, such schools of ours will be superseded by new national schools built by means of a local tax, and placed under a local committee. In this way many of our schools will be sacrificed, and our money sunk in them lost, after we erected them at much expense, in the confidence that Government would keep faith with us. Nay, even in cases in which the buildings are sufficient, and the teaching unexceptionable, if it so happens that the parish schools are thought sufficient, though the attendance in the parish schools is small, and in ours is large, ours must go to the wall. With regard to such of our schools as, under the name of "adopted schools," continue to receive public aid, they shall receive only a portion of the aid that is given to new national schools around them. They are to receive only a share of the Parliamentary grant; but the new national schools, besides receiving the same share of the Parliamentary grants, are to be favoured with additional grants from the local rates collected from us and others for their establishment and maintenance; while from such local rates, though we are to pay our full share of them, we are to receive no help whatever. The penalty is called, in gentle language, the price we are to pay for retaining their

management. (Laughter.) The penalty is to be aggravated by another injury. It is on such terms as the Board chooses to make with us for our school premises that any of them are to be taken. Of course that places us entirely at their mercy, even in regard to the schools that there may be an offer to spare. The practical wrongs threatened to us, even as to the large amount of money our people so nobly sank in school property for the sake of a great public interest, are such that if this be the kind of morality to be taught in the national schools we may be the first, but we are not destined to be the last, or the greatest, sufferers from it. It is not pretended that we are thus to be treated because we use our schools for sectarian purposes. Papists so use theirs of course. And Episcopalians are particularly offensive in this respect, employing their schools to proselytise our children to their semi-Popish customs; yet, judging from the past, we need not wonder if, before all be done, we find that, in one way and another, the Government, proving in this respect a praise to them that do evil and the terror of them that do well, will turn out wonderfully tender and bountiful to such evil-doers, while, though giving an education the most efficient as well as the most free from sectarianism of any education given in the kingdom, because we keep the management in our own hands, not for sectarian but for Christian and patriotic purposes, we are to be thus gradually strangled. To this fate we are doomed by this bill, not because we are giving the secular part of our education in a less efficient manner than others—for we stand at this moment, according to Government returns, at the head of all the schools in Great Britain. Nor can it be said with truth that we must be put out of the way because we stand in the way of Government reaching the uneducated classes. In whatever locality, in town or country, Government inspectors find schools still required, and voluntary exertions do not at once provide them, so far from hindering, we shall effectually assist, by local rates and under local committees, in having them set up. It cannot be said, with the slightest truth, that in demanding that, as regards public privileges, we shall have our schools placed on a level with others, we are raising hindrances, when instead we are giving most effectual help to the universal education of the people. No true, just reason can be assigned for this active enmity to the continued existence of our schools, except that their opponents, whether within our Church or beyond it, have spoken, and spoken, and spoken, and planned, and planned, and planned, in reference to what they call a national system, until I suppose they feel that they will not prove the patriots that they intended to prove, until something that may look like a realisation of their dream actually comes of all their labour. I may be mistaken, but I fear that, among the enemies of the continued connexion between church and school, there are some good men who have unconsciously allowed their politics to get the better of their religion, and see no way of getting the upper hand in their struggle with opponents, except by the adoption of such measures against the ascendancy of the latter as involves the separation of all the common schools of the country from ecclesiastical control. If successful, they will find, when it is too late, that they have obtained their object at a fearful sacrifice of a far higher interest than they have secured. Infinitely better would it be for them to foster the connexion between faithful churches and efficient schools, and so rear such a religious and moral as well as

enlightened people, that no corruption in Church or State would long stand before them. Then, too, there are those of the upper ranks, and of the political leanings by which their class is for the most part characterised, who will allow such a measure as this to be tried, in the expectation that we shall go to the wall, while they will retain for the Established Church, and for themselves, the power which they have. Others of our opponents, of course, hate the public influence of any Church in proportion to her fidelity to the truth, and her power in upholding its sway. But while there is no difficulty in accounting for the conduct of these last mentioned adversaries, I have sought in vain for a reason, that will stand investigation, to justify, or even to account for, the persistence of many in this course. They will think me a monomaniac in this matter, and I return the compliment by saying that the most charitable judgment I can entertain of their procedure is to think the same of them. (Laughter.) There is, at least, this difference between us—in my position I feel as if within the grateful shadow of a great cloud of witnesses. In their position I see them in the midst of a different kind of company—in a conclave that ill befits their character and aims. (Laughter and applause.) Reasons, however, of some kind have to be stated. And, as the outcry against the spirit of mutual distrust and bitterness and strife that we were alleged to be cherishing in children of different sections of the Church by our separate sectional schools is now silenced, our opponents, going upon another tact, make the very harmony among old and young—as ascertained from the extent to which the schools of all the churches are attended by the children of different communions—a conclusive reason for doing away with the denominational plan, and placing them all under a common management. But in this proposal two considerations are overlooked. It is forgotten that our schools are denominationally managed, not for the sake of denominational objects, but for the sake of securing, by an united vigorous Christian oversight, a life in our schools that could not otherwise be realised. It is forgotten, too, that the very rivalry thus called forth, so far from being an evil, is of immense benefit; and that of, say five hundred schools, belonging half-and-half to separate Churches, the efficiency of the whole is secured by separate management, when a joint management, partly by the same parties and partly by an infusion of others, especially when they descend to the position of a local committee of the government, would probably lead to a feebleness and hesitancy in the whole control, that would instantly tell with disastrous effect on the character and power for good of the great bulk of the schools concerned. Another grand objection to our Government grants was the waste of public money which they involved. That might take place under the old code, when salaries were paid to men, instead of remuneration given for scholars educated. But now that, under the new code, this latter principle regulates the grants, so far at least as the maintenance of schools is concerned, there can be no such waste of public money. For, be the schools as numerous, and the scholars as few, in each as imagination can conceive, Government only pays for results; and it is a matter of moonshine where, in how many or how few schools, or in schools of what connexion, the results, in the shape of well-taught pupils, are found, if the scholars are only forthcoming. It is said, however, in substance in the report of the Royal Commission, that our schools are a burden which we cannot

bear, that they are going down, and that it is, on that account, the duty of Government to provide otherwise for the education that we have been and are still giving. I have already exposed the deceptive statement about our declining numbers which is given in the report, and which is fitted—if not intended—to make the impression that we have undertaken to set up an educational system which, even in favourable circumstances, we could not maintain. The fact that we have maintained it up to this moment, to such an extent and in such a state of efficiency, in the midst of such adverse influences, is conclusive evidence that, were it set before our people as being as much a fixed and essential institution of the Church as any of our other schemes, what they did for it at the outset, and what they have done for it since, would, with ordinary efforts in its behalf, be far exceeded by what they would do for it in future. The fact is, that the great objection to it, and the great difficulty in dealing with it on the part of its opponents, is, that it will not die. Leading men around and even within our Church have assailed it with violence. Many of our people have been carefully taught to refuse it their help. Not a few have eaten up its resources while countenancing the efforts to set it aside. The very friends who have spoken in its favour have in the same breath pronounced it as being of course only under a suspended sentence of annihilation. Why, a title of the opprobrium and ill-usage heaped upon it, if heaped on almost any other scheme, would have long ago shamed its supporters away from all connection with it, and caused its being ere this buried out of sight. And yet this scheme survives, takes its place at the head of all similar institutions in the kingdom, and seems to indicate that it has something like a charmed life. Many who have shied or assailed it may wonder at this. I would wonder, too, if I had their notions of it—their miserable notions of it—but I believe that its life is bound up with the life of the Church. The man who speaks of the young receiving religious instruction at home as a thing to be depended on for their godly upbringing is speaking in unpardonable ignorance, or more unpardonable dissimulation, with reference to the condition of the great bulk of the homes concerned. The man who speaks of Sabbath school instruction as serving the purpose, is only proving that he has not the slightest conception of the subject on which he pronounces. The daily five hours' training of the young in common schools is more than ever a principal instrumentality which the Church has it still in her power to wield for the effectual godly upbringing of the young—the rearing of successive generations of intelligent and thoughtful members. Destroy that instrumentality, and the day that you do so the decay of the Church's spiritual life begins. Yet one of the leading proposals of this bill is gradually to wrest this instrumentality for ever out of our Church's hands. Its advocates tell us, indeed, that the rights of the parentage are preserved within the educational province, and that is enough to secure sufficient care of the religious interests of the young. The rights and duties of parents in relation to their offspring are sacred, weighty, and eventful beyond the power of words to utter; and their general indifference to the proper exercise of their authority, and the due discharge of their obligations, are so loosening all the bonds of law and government, human and divine, that unless by some marvellous work of grace the hearts of the fathers are turned to their children, and then of the children to the fathers, that both may be turned to God, He will ere long surely smite

the land with a curse. But, supposing the rights of parents to be preserved, so far as apart from the Church they could be preserved, in this educational measure, these rights cannot be allowed to override and absorb the rights of the Church, which are equally distinct and divine. It is, moreover, only under the authority of the Church that the rights of parents within her communion are shielded, and that the performance of their duties is secured. And one of the heaviest charges to be brought against such a measure is, that what God has joined together it dares to put asunder. The inevitable consequence will be, that, left without the Church's supervision, parents, even while belonging to the Church, will still more miserably perform their duty than they do at present, in looking after the daily Christian education of their children, or they will neglect it altogether. But are the rights of Christian parents recognised, and the way left open to secure the performance of their duties? So far from that, they are placed on precisely the same level with parents who may be utter profligates or infidels. So far as they are to have any power at all under this measure, it must be simply in their character of citizens; and there is not the shadow of a security that their voice as Christian fathers shall ever be heard in the local educational counsels. Nay, more, under this measure there is not the slightest provision even for parents, as such, whether Christian or heathen, being able to exercise any power in the education of their children. It does not require that there shall be a single parent in the local committees; and yet we are told that parents, and even Christian parents, have all their rights preserved. But though parents, and even professedly Christian parents, had their power in the education of their offspring as fully and formally recognised, as such a measure might perhaps be constructed to recognise them otherwise, every such measure must of necessity perpetrate the heaviest injury to parents, as well as to the Church, in preventing their joint action, in the endeavour suitable to each, to have the Christian education of the young, to which they stand mutually committed and pledged, effectually accomplished. In the present day especially, when the bonds of all law are severing, and when, through the carelessness and incompetency of parents, their power over their children is so paralysed, and when almost the only instrumentality which the Churches might yet effectually wield for the training and moulding of the young is the Christian education of the daily school, if the Churches fling that power from them, or allow it to be wrested from their hands, I for one see nothing before us but the rising up of an atheistic generation. In that case, when, in the untaught and unteachable, the light-minded, carnal membership with which you fill the very Church, you reap the fruit of the early education to which you gave your sanction, you will indeed have cause for the bitterest sorrow that the power which you still have for performing so sacred and eventful a duty, you cast so vilely away. But take the case of parents in another way, and suppose them to be as faithful as the Church could desire. All the more earnestly would such parents beseech you never to part with your right and power of assisting them to provide for such an education of their children as will train them for a Christian life on earth and eternal life in heaven. It would be impossible to construct a more irreligious bill, except one that positively forbade religion to be introduced into the common schools of the country. If I mistake not, in the whole seventy-one heads, under which the provi-

sions of this bill are arranged, there is no allusion to religion at all, except in one instance in which the word occurs under the 47th head, when providing that inspectors shall not examine any pupils on their religious knowledge, except requested in any particular case to do so by the managers. The only provision for religion in the schools is involved in the supposition that the local committees, who are contemplated as persons ultimately to have the whole power over the branches of instruction to be given, may be depended on to include right religious instruction among the branches. But is that supposition a basis on which to rest the Christianity taught in our schools, as regards its bearing on the religious interests of the young, and of our families and Churches, and of the land itself? The School Committee for any burgh is to be appointed by the town council, and to consist of not fewer than four or more than eight members. They may be men of any religious profession, or of none. They may be moral or immoral characters. They may represent all the Churches, or one of the Churches to the exclusion of the rest, or no Church at all. But suppose they reflect a little of each of the distinctive characteristics of the Churches, and none of them specially. They do not fly so high as the Free Church, nor so low as the Moderates. They are not so Calvinistic as the United Presbyterians, nor such "free-willers" as the Morrisonians. They are not so Popish as the Papists, or even as the Scotch Episcopalians; nor such sticklers for the Covenant as the Reformed Presbyterians. And at the same time they have among them, more or less frequently, a sceptic or a scoffer, and very often regular thorough-going men of the world, who would regard "too much religion," as they call it—that is, in reality, any decided inculcation of it—a hindrance rather than a help to the preparation of the young for their getting on in life. Surely the very most you could expect in schools managed by such a committee of citizens would be the teaching, not of any religious truth in particular, but of religions in the general—a new and happy kind of Broad Churchism, which no division of the Church would recognise as what it believes to be the truth of God. Such a happy indefiniteness in any religion remaining in the schools would, of course, admirably dovetail into and strengthen the general tendencies of the age, and rear the young in such a manner that, on leaving school, they would be able, with a delightful sense of freedom to say that, as regards religion, they had learned at school not to trouble themselves much about it. Even that is almost a mere ideal state of perfection, in its own way, to which the religious part of common-school education might be expected to reach. Fully as likely a result would be that according as Protestantism or Popery, Free Churchism or Moderatism, Voluntaryism or downright indifferentism prevailed in any district, the religious instruction in school would, for a time, reveal the predominating religious peculiarity accordingly. More especially over the vast extent of the rural parishes, the overwhelming power in the parish schools, whether on their present footing or the new footing offered to them, would be in the hands of the landlords, and so the religion taught in them would become more and more a religion of mere formalities of one kind or another. And even our own schools, planted and maintained at such an amount of labour and expense on our part, would fall under the general predominating landlord and moderate influence and control, and cease to serve the blessed purposes for which they have been set up. And the final result of the

whole operations of this local school-committee-system would be that religion disappeared from the schools altogether, or lingered in them in such a pitiful form as might suffice to make angels weep and devils triumph. But you may ask, Are there not among the other Government officers and directing bodies to be connected with the system, some whose presence and agency will help to secure its proper place to the religious element? So far from that, they are of such a character that their influence is most likely to operate emphatically in the wrong direction. Passing over the sheriffs of counties, who figure in the bill as charged with certain formalities connected with the appointment of local committees in rural parishes, we come into the presence of the supreme board of directors, who have such tremendous powers in determining what existing schools shall be knocked on the head and where new schools shall be planted, in taxing any and every parish and town in the kingdom, one after another, for school funds, and in summarily disposing of all the teachers in the land. And who constitutes this Board? The four provosts of the four largest towns, four representatives of the four universities, three gentlemen from the counties of Inverness, Perth, and Ayr, and four appointed by the Crown, constitute the Board. Considering the composition of this Board, it is certainly so far well that it is no part of their function to meddle with religion in schools. For the people of Scotland, degenerate as they may be, and may be becoming, would still laugh to scorn any effort of such a Board to regulate the religious teaching in schools. But the mischief is, that the powers which they have over teachers must naturally make the latter very much look to them as masters of their destiny, and therefore, even though unconsciously, imbibe their spirit. And, so far as they do so, I ask any man who knows the facts of the case whether the influence of such a body on the religion of our common schools, so far as their influence operates, will not be of an unequivocally hurtful character? If you try to take refuge from their influence, under that of the Board of University Examiners that are henceforth to become our teachers, your prospects of the exercise of a favourable influence on the Christianity of the schools is not improved. For the most that we look for from our university men is, that our youth, who have anything to do with them, may escape from their hands, without having imbibed a dislike to evangelical religion, that will tell with fatal power on their after character and history. Then, too, we have a body of inspectors, than whom, so far as I know them, more excellent men could not be found for the work. But their principal duty at present is, and ere long probably their exclusive duty will become, to inspect and report on the state of education in the schools secularly; and they cannot, if they would, interfere with the religious instruction in schools so as to improve its spiritual quality and power. But, then, the Normal Schools were to be with some of our friends the grand security for the Christian training of national teachers, and the consequent Christian education of the schools. A purer imagination never entered the minds of intelligent men than the notion that we would be allowed under a national system to keep the training of its teachers in the hands of our Church, or that, if permitted to do so, we could get the thousands yearly from our people that would be required for that end. No! the training of the teachers will be in keeping with the rest of the system. But even if we were to have the training of them, what would that matter? No man thinks more highly of our teachers

as a class than I do; and I have had opportunities of forming my opinions by personal intercourse with many of them in different parts of the country. But even now, while the Churches train them, some of them are getting so heady and high-minded and obstreperous—(laughter)—as to all Church control, that you have only to read the style in which they have begun to speak, in order to see that, when this national scheme is in full operation, and teachers are moulded under its influences, we shall find a race of teachers planted over the land to be thorns in the sides and pricks in the eyes of the ministers and best members of the Churches, and anything but a credit or a strength to the cause of religion. (Hisses, and cries of “Oh, oh.”) In the *Museum* of last December, a letter from a parochial teacher, contains such sentences and clauses as the following:—“Every practical teacher knows that the so-called religious difficulty is a myth, a convenient cover to hide clerical crookedness. . . . Moderatism, Free Churchism, and Voluntaryism, and all the other isms, so fertile in unintelligible schisms are the grand desiderata. The able paper read by Mr John Mayer, of Glasgow, before the Social Science Association, at Manchester, clearly demonstrates the possibility of confining the schoolmaster’s attention to secular subjects, with advantage to the cause of education. What has succeeded in Glasgow, (in the secular school there,) in the midst of such determined and unscrupulous opposition, may and will succeed elsewhere, particularly if recognised as a national institution. Elsewhere, indeed, without such recognition, it has already succeeded to admiration, and invariably with the result of removing the school from the oppressive atmosphere of clerical intrigue.”

Again, a teacher in the February number says—“The religious difficulty is felt by none but the clergymen of the different sects. . . . The teachers who are regularly trained are ready, and entitled to become members of an independent profession. The clergy are perfectly capable of instructing the whole people, young and old, in religion, and *they*, and *they* only should do it. . . . As much, if not more, moral education would be administered without the Bible and Catechism. . . . Religious instruction should be given at a separate time, and by a different person, if possible from the public teacher.”

And to quote only from another writer of the character, in the number for March, a Free Church teacher says—“The religious difficulty lurks under a clerical mask. . . . I do not care what becomes of Free Church schools; but I think it is not too much to expect that the claims of Free Church teachers, who, in the face of great difficulties, have maintained their position, are entitled to equal consideration with parochial teachers under any new system that may be introduced.” The measure now proposed thus places before us the prospect of a system of national education, with secular training of the teachers in normal schools, with secular examiners, and a secular board of directors, and secular local committees, and secular inspectors. The youth that are to attend these schools belong chiefly to three great divisions of the old Presbyterian Church of Scotland, that promoted and fostered the Scottish school system, and has been all through its history its main stay. The ministers of these three great bodies, numbering between two and three thousand, are set apart to watch over the interests of religion and learning, and are planted for that purpose in every corner of the land. Yet they are now to be for ever shut out from the place that belongs to

them, and through them to the Church, in the education of the young, except, indeed, as when they are permitted to come in at all, they come in by election in their character of citizens, like other citizens, and as members of local committees. And even then they must come in without their legitimate influence and the legitimate influence of the Church exercised through their instrumentality, only to occupy the degraded position assigned to them, and to find that, along with their ministerial status, their ministerial influence is gone. It is so in the local school boards of the United States. The ministers are in them to the extent of hundreds; but they have not the power, or, in their position, they have lost the heart, to attempt to work that system in a more Christian way. And in the nature of things, it will be so with us. Not chosen at all, or chosen at best to find that we can represent no principle but that which is common to us with the most diverse kinds of religionists, we shall cease to strive for the supremacy of any definite vital religious principle whatever, and abandon or avoid a position in which we serve no good purpose. It is an ominous thing for my country that such a system should dare to lift up its head in Scotland; for your patience would utterly fail me before I had told, if I were to attempt to tell, all its demerits. It presents itself to our acceptance under the pretence of being an extension of the old parochial system, the system of John Knox and Andrew Melville. But that system had for essential characteristics the connexion between a living earnest evangelical Church and schools controlled by its authority and imbued with its spirit. Under the false pretence of extending that system, this measure will lay that system in the dust. It is a system that breathes the spirit, and will put forth the power, of an intolerable State tyranny over the consciences of multitudes. For what is it to do? It is to set up eight men in every town, and some similar number in every parish, who may be of any religion or of none, to do what? To make all of us citizens to contribute a common tax for education, to take our money and build schools, to appoint teachers, and prescribe the whole instruction, secular and religious, to be taught in these schools, and to compel us to take the religious or irreligious instruction, and other instruction which they may choose to assign to our children. Further, after taking our money by this local tax, and getting also additional help from the Parliamentary grants to sustain such schools, we must, forsooth, accept the religious or irreligious instruction which the State, by its civil boards, local and general, have thus at our own expense provided for us; or, if not satisfied, we must, unaided by either Parliamentary or parochial grants, out of our remaining resources, as we best can, build and maintain schools in which to secure for our people such education as we believe to be indispensable. I take it, that not in our day has there been such another instance of an attempt to trample on all our civil and religious rights and privileges. Talk after that of the annuity-tax! (Laughter.) Why, that tax at least leaves those who reluctantly pay it at liberty to build and frequent churches of their own. But here is an annuity-tax threatened in every parish for the support of a system of religious or irreligious instruction in schools, to which many of our people will be compelled to send their children, however much they are opposed to it, or let them go without education altogether. And the strangest feature of this whole business is, that more or fewer of our Voluntary brethren are

very much at the bottom of this whole movement, and that they have been crying themselves hoarse all the while professedly against the lawfulness of religious endowments, and against the very shadow of every kind and degree of compulsion in religion. It is one of the many strange spectacles of the present day, and an indication that if the beginning of the end be so unaccountable, it is of no use to try to conjecture what the end itself shall be. I for one, though no Voluntary, will resist to the uttermost this intolerable and most presumptuous attempt, not only to take my money for the support of a system which I believe will be religiously pernicious and fatal to the best interests of those for whom I am bound to care, but place their religious interests under the supreme irresponsible control of a mere civil board which is called into existence and upheld by an arbitrary exercise of the power of the civil government of the country. (Loud applause.) The system that thus seeks to rear itself on the ruins of the old Scottish plan of education, has not even the merit of being uniform and simple. The present schools of Scotland are pertinaciously assailed because the management is diverse, as if their opponents were more anxious about the symmetry of their management than the success of their labours. And yet, what do they now offer instead, but a patched and piebald system after all—(laughter)—with its parish schools, and its adopted schools, and its new national schools, and its combined national schools, and its various bodies of management, equally various and diverse, and as oddly and ominously constituted. (Renewed laughter.) Not that I object to this variety, when it grows naturally out of the irrepressible free life of a great people; for the whole constitution of England is just a gradual combination of such diverse facts. But I utterly object to and abhor such a combination, when it proceeds on the principle, on which this measure proceeds, of gradually exhausting and extinguishing by a formal process the most healthful forms of the national school life of my country, and of sparing only the less healthful forms of it; and then trying, by artificial and unprincipled means, of raising up other new forms of this life, in flagrant contempt of all lessons of observation and experience. In this patched and piebald system I see three elements conspicuous. First, I see predominant still an ecclesiastico-political tyranny. It continues to retain within its grasp the parish schools, and is not very likely, for the sake of the small pecuniary temptation held out, to let go its hold of them in a hurry. It has also the fair prospect of getting within its reach, and under its control, schools of our own, and other new schools in rural parishes, in the local committees of which it will, in most cases, have the majority of votes, and often control the rest. Then, too, the Board of Directors and the Court of Examiners will generally use their influence in the same direction. So conspicuous is this tyranny of the class in question preserved and extended over such a large portion of the existing and prospective schools, that I wonder how any man calling himself a Liberal politician could have the courage coolly to commend such a scheme to our acceptance. Next, with all respect for the Christian Voluntaryism of the land, I see a second element at work in this system, a purblind political Voluntaryism, that is insidiously thrusting forward its half-reasoned and self-contradictory maxims on a subject on which it has precious little reason for being so heard and listened to, considering how little it has done by

its labours and sacrifices in the educational field. (Applause.) And there is further to be plainly seen at work, in this measure, a not less purblind irreligious Liberalism, the illegitimate offspring of the Whiggism of 1688, that has broken loose from the control of the Word of God, and in its self-conceited course is ready to inflict upon us theories and measures that will unsettle all things, and turn society into a troubled sea that cannot rest, whose waters cast up mire and dirt. These are the three unclean spirits that reveal their special presence and power in the measure proposed. (Laughter, cheers, and cries of "Oh, oh.") And the question is, What is now to be done? Here I confess my heart has been like to fail me. For while I believe we could still save the cause that ought to be so dear to us all, were we united in our views and resolutions, judging from the past, I fear there may be those among us who are prepared to surrender our position, and the grand old principles that our position still embodies. There still ring in my ears the words to which utterance was given in former days within our communion, that seemed to me then of ominous import, and that, unless we prove united on the old ground, are perhaps now to bear their bitter fruit; words to this effect that you cannot by the teachers in common schools whip the love of Christ into the young, that the monies of a church are sacred to redemption, and that the question is one to be settled, not in Presbyteries, but on civil platforms. Such language, though marked only by its plausible unmeaningness and transparent sophistry, yet being uttered with an air of wisdom and authority, no doubt influenced politicians and other people to promote and countenance the withdrawal of education from under Church control. And so on all occasions and in various forms the announcement has been perseveringly made that all Church control over the schools must cease. There is also before my eyes the spectacle of those whom I trusted, revered, and followed, who, instead of standing fast to ancient principles, at length yielded to the demand that all direct connexion of the Church with education must cease, and so leaving the high platform on which they had placed the cause and taken their stand beside it, have come down and down in their concessions and proposals till no one seems able to predict where they will halt and make a final stand. Well, if any such counsels are now to guide you, it is time for you to proclaim the fact that such as I am may stand aside, and let others guide you forward in a course which I do not believe is destined to prove the way of wisdom, or the path of peace. If any of your rowers shall, with your consent, row you farther into these deep waters, they must take charge of the vessel, and be answerable for its fate. (Applause.) Mr Nixon concluded by proposing the following resolutions:—

“ That, after the Education Report had been received, he would move as follows:—1st, That the proposed bill, by continuing the present exclusive management of the parish schools in the hands of a minority of the heritors and the parish minister, shutting out from all share in it the larger number of the owners of land, and the entire tenantry throughout the rural districts of the country, violates alike the civil and religious rights of the people, sets at nought all the rightful claims that have been urged for many years to have these schools dealt with as really national schools, and runs counter to the entire professed tenor of all present legislation otherwise; is a specimen of such legislation as was

understood to be past and gone, and all the more offensive that it concerns an interest which lies nearest the heart of the people of Scotland ; and that even the alternative proposal to place the parish schools, under certain conditions, in the hands of local parish committees, would render the management of them only seemingly, but not really, more open and popular, since the landowners, who at present have them in their hands, would still have preserved to them such a position in the proposed local committees as would almost invariably secure to them a preponderating power.

“2d. That while the education given in the schools of the Free Church is proved by the Government reports to place them at the head of all the schools in the empire, according to this bill, only such of them as the General Board adopt, are in future to receive any public aid whatever ; that, even those are to receive only a share of the Parliamentary grant, but no share of the local rates raised from the whole community for the maintenance of the new national schools around them ; that no aid henceforth shall be allowed to us, either from the Parliamentary grant or from local rates, towards the erection of new schools, or the repairing or enlargement of adopted ones ; and that a number of our existing schools will be suppressed for the sake of the parish schools, or superseded, by the erection in their place, of new national ones ; and that the treatment thus given to our Free Church schools, especially when contrasted with that to be given to the parish schools, renders the injustice done to the former peculiarly oppressive and unjustifiable.

“3d. That the plan proposed for the management of national education most unwarrantably ignores such facts as the two following, viz., That the common school education of Scotland, which has done so much for our people, has for the three hundred years of its existence depended chiefly for its efficiency on the ministers of the Presbyterian population ; and that between two and three thousand of these Presbyterian ministers are planted chiefly in three great divisions over Scotland, whose whole life is devoted to the furtherance of divine and useful learning among old and young, and who are *ex officio* the guardians of education, as well as of Christianity ; that the proposed measure would place at the head of our public education a board of fifteen men, of whom, probably, some would not have the knowledge, others would not have the time, others would not have the sympathy with the public mind, required for the management of this great interest ; while the local committees would probably often be composed of such members as the best friends of education could not regard with respect and confidence, and such as neither exercised nor possessed the proper authority and influence for successfully moulding the minds and morals of the young. That the central board, the court of examiners, and the local committees which the bill proposes to institute, are to have, respectively, the sole power of regulating the training, licensing, electing, and disposing of teachers ; the power of determining the whole subjects, religious as well as secular, taught in the schools ; and the power of taxing the whole community, as they see cause, for the support of the system of education. That these agencies are all secular, their existence and powers being derived from civil government, and their qualifications being entirely civil and secular. That the common school, being one of the most important instrumentalities by which the character of each rising

generation is determined, the civil government, through those who are its civil servants, thus claims and undertakes to mould the character of the whole youth of this kingdom. That the religious as well as secular instruction to be given to the young is thus determined and provided for at the public expense. That all of us must pay for this instruction, however much we are conscientiously opposed to it. That at the same time we are to be refused all public aid, and obliged to pay out of our own resources for such education of our young as we believe to be alone healthful; that there is thus a State tyranny exerted over us in regard to the most sacred of our interests; and that, in the name of religious as well as civil liberty, we are bound to resist this tyranny to the uttermost.

“4th, That while there is reason for thankfulness to find from the report of the commissioners, that the deficiency either in the extent or the quality of the education at present being given in Scotland, is not so great as was alleged, it is the duty of all Christian and patriotic Scotchmen to welcome any proper means for meeting the deficiency, in either respect, that still exists; that no general uniform system can be recognised by this Church as an extension of the old parochial school system, which does not place the parish schools, with all others that are supported by public funds, under a management that duly represents the Government, the Churches, and the parentage of the land; and that as regards the religious as well as other interests involved in this question, while it is the duty of civil government to acknowledge and support only the truth, in the circumstances in which we are placed, and until a proper extension of the parochial system is provided, the least objectionable interim arrangement would be to amend the conditions that regulate the grants to schools in Scotland; to place the schools under undenominational inspectors, to drop the questions anent religion from the schedule, and, after allowing freedom for a limited time, for increased educational exertions on the part of those already in the field, or other similar agencies, to provide, by means of local rates and committees, or otherwise, additional schools wherever they are still required.”

Mr SAWERS, Gargunnoch, seconded the motion.

Sir HENRY MONCREIFF moved the following amendment—“That the General Assembly, looking to the great and critical importance of the question as to the bearing and tendency of the report of her Majesty's Commissioners with reference to education, resolve to appoint a special committee for the purpose of considering what course should be taken as to that question by the present Assembly, with instructions to report to a future diet.” (Applause.) There are various reasons, he said, which induce me to make this proposal. I think, speaking generally, we are not yet sufficiently conversant, perhaps, with all the particulars of this report to come to any such enlarged and specific deliverance as is contained in Mr Nixon's motion, even if we were to agree to it. I think we ought to look very carefully at so important a matter before we come to a distinct and specific conclusion about it. But I have another observation of great consequence to which I would draw Mr Nixon's attention. When I looked at his motion I received the impression, which has been confirmed by his speech, that we have here mixed up with objections to the report, in which we might agree, objections

taken against the views of those in this Church and elsewhere who have partly been instrumental in inducing Government to appoint a commission, and in leading the Commissioners to consider the subject. We are mixing up objections to their views with objections to the particular report that the Commissioners have now issued. Now, surely these subjects ought not in this Assembly to be mixed up together. If we have a controversy among ourselves—a controversy on which Mr Nixon has a strong opinion in common with many others, and which would give rise to a vote among ourselves—we ought to have that clearly set apart from the questions of objections to this report of the Commissioners in which we must all agree. There may be objections to this report in which we all agree. I say nothing about what the character of these objections may be. It may be there are some of those proposals not exactly in harmony with all the views of each of the Commissioners himself. We may suppose they have come to a conclusion on this report as the best conclusion they can come to, looking at all the differences of opinion, and have endeavoured to adjust the matter in the best way practicable. There may be objections entertained by us to particular parts of this report, and it would be right for us specifically to condescend upon them, and to endeavour to remove them by amendments upon this bill, if it should be introduced; and there may be objections of such a character as would render the whole measure one that it would not be advisable to introduce at all. But, then, we require to look very carefully at the question how far particular objections that we may take to what is proposed by the Commissioners are objections that might be removed by amendments on the bill, and how far they are objections that go to destroy the value of the whole proposals? Now, I give no opinion on this, because, first of all, I do not think it suitable at present to do so, and, in the next place, I confess I have not had time to give such attention to the recommendations of the Commissioners and to the bill as to be able fully to make up my mind upon every point respecting it. But I think Mr Nixon, in speaking of his own peculiar views and talking in such very strong language as he has used, did apparently forget at one stage of his argument two things. First of all, he forgot that the continuance of the system which he himself was advocating depends, in part, on the continuance of Government grants, at least under existing circumstances. I do not know what he can mean unless he means that he desires the continuance of the grants to the denominational schools as such. If we are to have the denominational system continued, I suppose Mr Nixon means the Government, in order to avoid the tyranny of which he speaks, ought to continue denominational grants. Well, then, of course he differs from a number of very excellent persons on that point. I conclude he thinks so, because in other parts of his argument he complained of the great hardship and tyranny which would result from an arrangement whereby certain grants which he alludes to, and which are given now, would be given no more. It may be all very well to talk of tyranny, and to speak of this matter in connexion with other objections that have been taken to tyranny by the State over men's consciences, if what you were advocating were simply a system that the Church was to carry on without aid from the Government; but you cannot speak exactly in the same tone when your own system is one that is to depend upon aid from the Government. Further, there is another thing Mr Nixon forgets—

namely, that the motives he has spoken of are not the only motives that have induced men to desire an alteration of the present system, and that the present system is unsatisfactory—nay offensive—to the consciences of many, because you cannot go on to get your denominational grants, except under a system which endows both truth and error. (Hear, hear.) The one great difficulty in this whole subject is, that the present system of the Privy Council grants endows both truth and error. The only motive, therefore, for having a change, and looking to a national system, is not a desire to get free from Church influence, but a desire to make the best of the present state of things—to get the best system you can consistently with any sort of principle; and to the mind of many it would be better that the Government system were one that implied Government having nothing to do with religious instruction, than that it should endow both truth and error, as they were now doing. (Applause.) I am not going to press one side or other, but I say Mr Nixon ought to have kept this in view throughout his argument. I think his argument proceeded on a basis which would not have stood had he kept that prominently before him while he was speaking. But I have one or two things further to urge why we should not immediately give any specific deliverance. For example, to show you should pause before you come to a conclusion, Mr Nixon has dwelt strongly upon the fact that the whole scope and tendency of the proposals made by this Education Commission is to keep up and uphold—and this is one of the unclean spirits to which he refers—(laughter)—the aristocratical power of the landowners over these schools. I shall not dwell here upon the fact that it might be quite possible to meet this objection by having the word “heritors” explained in the interpretation clause of the bill, in a larger sense than that in which it is now understood; but I wish to inform Mr Nixon of what I have some reason to be aware of. In another place, not far from this, I have the strongest reason to believe that there will be another educational report brought forward from another committee—a report that speaks about as strongly and as vehemently against the Commissioners’ proposal as Mr Nixon, but which takes exactly opposite grounds, and says that the whole scope and tendency of this measure is to destroy the existing arrangements of the parish schools—to take it out of the hands of the existing management, and to expose the whole system to the dangers of popular management. I have reason to believe that before a day or two is over, you will see this is the fact. Now, I cannot but think that a report which meets with such very opposite attacks in one place and in another—which calls forth Mr Nixon’s opposition on the ground that it is going to perpetuate the close system of management, and which calls forth as strong opposition on the other side on the ground that it is going to destroy the close system—I cannot but think that such a report requires very careful consideration before you come to a definite conclusion about it. I have another thing to say. I wish you to notice the last sentence of Mr Nixon’s own motion, under No. 4, where he speaks of an “interim arrangement.” Observe the particulars he gives of his interim arrangement as stated in the terms of his motion. Now, I am not going to give any distinct opinion of my own upon the point to which I now refer. I can only assure Mr Nixon and this House that there are other persons well acquainted and versant with the whole scope of this report by the Royal Commissioners who would tell you—

and I do not think they can be far wrong, from what I have seen of it—that they almost in every particular have provided the very things that Mr Nixon has suggested as an interim arrangement. (Hear, hear.) If you ask some of the supporters of that report as to those arrangements about the parish and other denominational schools, I must say it is their honest persuasion of that report that the Commissioners are dealing equally with the parish and other denominational schools in the arrangement that is proposed as an interim one—though how long it may last is another question. Now, when it can with plausibility be said that Mr Nixon's own suggestion as to what should be *ad interim* comes very near what is proposed in the report, that surely gives a good reason why we should pause, examine, and consider, before you go all at once into such a voluminous and specific motion as Mr Nixon has laid on your table. (Hear, hear.) A great deal has been said by Mr Nixon about enmity to our schools, which, he says, seems to exist in some quarters—and he says it in very strong language. This enmity appears to apply sometimes to people among ourselves apparently who differ from Mr Nixon, sometimes to people who are hostile to spiritual religion, and sometimes to the Royal Commissioners. He speaks of the enmity in this Commission to our schools, but I do not think there is one particle of proof, or a single indication of any such enmity from beginning to end of the report. (Hear, and applause.) Again, there is another gratuitous suggestion which Mr Nixon makes, of which he can find no proof. He says that in all likelihood, in the application of the scheme, undue favour would be given to Episcopalians and others. Now, I am sure it is proposed to put all our schools exactly on the same footing, yet it is said that in all likelihood they will give all the favour to the Episcopalians. There is not the slightest ground for this allegation. There is another thing as to which Mr Nixon seems to object unreasonably—it is proposed that the Board shall be a thoroughly Scotch Board at any rate, including, no doubt, members of all denominations in Scotland; and from this fact alone it is difficult to see where there can be room for the enmity of which Mr Nixon speaks, or of the favour to Episcopalians, of which, he says, there is the likelihood. Considering the state of things in this country, I think we should have some provosts on our side. (Hear, hear.) We have had gentlemen who are provosts representing us in this Court, and we have had gentlemen who are professors in our universities. (Hear, hear.) No doubt the very idea of a national system, as sought for by this Church, did imply that you would run the risk under it of parties becoming hostile to your system, or doing it an injury; no doubt it was thought better to trust to the mind of the people of Scotland than to go on with a system for endowing both truth and error. Therefore we must keep these things in view when we are listening to Mr Nixon's eloquence. I have only one further observation to make. I wish to point out one thing connected with a recommendation in this report which commends it to the attention of this Assembly; to all who understand the state of things in Scotland, one recommendation included in this report is of the greatest importance, and may be of the most serious consequence to us. You know the Revised Code, which Mr Nixon has in some degree spoken of favourably. It is at present suspended, on the ground that it was not altogether adapted to Scotland—that, if possible, a special measure for Scotland

ought to be discovered. It stands suspended in order that those connected with our system of education, if they can, may devise a system that will suit Scotland. If you can do so, you will be allowed to manage matters in Scotland for yourselves; if you cannot, you must have the Revised Code as in England. Now, what do the Commissioners say on this point? They say that the Revised Code must be modified. With respect to article 4 of the Revised Code, they unanimously agree that it must not apply to Scotland; that is to say, the article which requires a special separation of classes—classes of the people, I mean—as to the schools that they attend; that the poor shall not attend the same schools as those who are above them, as we do in Scotland at present; that teachers shall not be allowed to present any but children who are described as children of the labouring poor as results of examination. That was considered to be destructive to the principle upon which our educational scheme had been conducted. I know from the testimony of some of the teachers, while the Revised Code might have answered them very well upon any other system, that that article in the Code, interpreted as it has been, would not answer them at all. Now, observe the recommendation that this article should be expunged gives you what in regard to this Code would make it workable. You have a decided recommendation upon this point, which is a very critical one in the present state of the case. You have a unanimous recommendation that this article 4 ought not to apply to Scotland. Well, then, I think you ought not to act rashly, or without good and thoroughly well-considered grounds; you ought to see that you are not instrumental in preventing any measure being framed founded upon this report. For if no measure can be carried as the result of it, then the Revised Code will come upon you without modification. And I believe that will be destructive. There is very good reason why we should be very careful in committing ourselves by such a motion as Mr Nixon has laid before you. I may add that I sympathise with Mr Nixon in his objection to the close system of heritors alone managing the parish schools. I think that the management of the parish schools ought to be far more open. I think we ought to do all we can to get them opened up. At the same time, I do not think that if this measure were passed, the matter would be pressed upon us in the mode or form Mr Nixon describes. Some parties in another quarter to which I have referred, do not think so. Sir Henry concluded by moving his resolution.

Mr NIXON said that to save the time of the Assembly he would be most happy to agree to Sir Henry's motion.

Mr STARK, Greenock, seconded the motion made by Sir Henry. In doing so, he said that he supposed Mr Nixon could not speak at all unless he spoke strongly, but he thought it was most undignified that a motion should be submitted to the Assembly of the Free Church of Scotland with the strong language about "State tyranny" contained in Mr Nixon's motion. He had no objection, of course, to the use of any terms which Mr Nixon might choose to employ, in so far as he, (Mr S.,) and other members of the House were not to be held as in any way responsible for them, but when it was proposed to embody them in a judgment of the General Assembly, he must protest against them. They had no right to impute motives to the Commissioners, or to charge them with tyranny. The Commissioners had had a most difficult question to settle,

and they ought to give them credit for purity of motive. (Hear, hear.) There was nothing to be gained by going to Parliament with such unfounded complaints; and if we expect to have any influence in the settlement of the education question on a right basis, we must employ language befitting the supreme Court of the Church. He did not altogether dislike to hear it in a speech, but it was out of place in a motion. (Laughter.)

Mr CHARLES COWAN said that he had heard the address of the Convener with the utmost surprise. If that address of his was supposed to represent the sentiments of the Education Committee or this House, it must inevitably postpone, beyond the possibility of its being carried into effect during the present lifetime, any national system of education. What was the sum and essence of that long and rapid torrent of eloquence to which they had listened for two hours but this, that unless the people of Scotland took their education from him, and such as him, they would have none at all? He thought it worthy of being known to this Assembly, and to the people of Scotland at large, that the late Lord Elgin, a nobleman whom he had the honour of escorting into this House on one occasion, when he was Governor-General of Canada, in 1851 or 1852, devised a system of national education with as great, indeed far greater, difficulties to encounter as statesmen could have in Scotland. The upper province of Canada was Protestant; and the lower was Catholic, and one leading feature of the bill which was successfully carried—though he did not think it would be acceptable to his reverend friends here—was, that in that bill a clause was introduced that no ecclesiastic of any denomination, as such, should have any right to the management of the schools in Canada. If they were elected by the local parties, good and well; and he believed until they had some such measure as this, embodying a provision of that kind, amid all the ecclesiastical opposition which rose up, to the effect of burking any well-devised measure, it was impossible to expect a system such as the people of Scotland were entitled to, and which was so greatly needed in this country. He hoped that the principle Lord Elgin introduced, and which had been the means of conferring a great benefit on Canada, might be carried out in this country. It was a great discouragement to listen to a speech so directly antagonistic to any such hopes.

Principal LUMSDEN said that Mr Cowan must have very much mistaken Mr Nixon, if he supposed that Mr Nixon meant to say that they should prevent a national education in Scotland, unless on condition that it should be entirely imparted by themselves. And let it be understood, without disparagement to Lord Elgin's Bill for Canada, that what was best for one country might not be the best for another.

Mr NIXON—I must explain. My excellent friend, Sir Henry Moncreiff, has misunderstood me most thoroughly. He has ventured to express opinions upon subjects on which I was silent, and I wish it to be especially understood that I do not hold the sentiments he has attributed to me. With regard to the charge he thinks I am liable to, of countenancing a system which endows both truth and error, I argue that Government—in the circumstances in which we are placed—should let the whole subject of education in religion alone. As I said before, if Government cannot support the truth alone, it ought to do the next best thing—leave it to be administered by those in whose hands the schools

are. I wish them to be in the hands of Christian men—of religious bodies,—which is a very different thing from local committees. I ask the Government to pay for the secular education of schools, and we pay for religious education in the contributions we make to uphold them; and the parents pay for both. We pay for the control, and Government pays for the secular education we give to the children of the State. If national education is to be a secular thing, what on earth have we to do with it, any more than with a Reform Bill? Sir Henry says that another body is opposed to the measure, but people do not require to be told how extremes meet in these days. Was there ever a more lawless state of things in the political world than there is at present? But I have accounted for that by showing that there are diverse elements in this measure of the Commissioners struggling for the mastery, though, unfortunately, none of them is the right element of Christ's authority. Mr Nixon concluded by denying that the language he had used in the resolutions, or in his speech, was entitled to be spoken of in the offensive language which was used in regard to it.

The motion was then agreed to, and the Assembly also resolved to refer Mr Nixon's resolutions to the committee for consideration.

Sir HENRY MONCREIFF then read over the names proposed for the committee.

Mr ROSE, Minard, objected to the constitution of the committee. He thought there should be some representatives from the West Highlands, which was greatly interested in this question.

Mr NIXON also complained of the constitution of the committee, and suggested that in a matter of such importance the appointment of the committee should be left over till to-morrow.

Dr BUCHANAN said that if it was to raise discussion it would be very inconvenient to have it introduced to-morrow. There was no reason why the names should not be suggested now.

Mr NIXON then suggested some additional names, and the committee, so enlarged, was appointed.

REFERENCE BY SYNOD OF MORAY—COMPLAINT OF MR MOFFAT OF CAIRNIE.

The Assembly then took up a reference from the Synod of Moray, connected with which was a complaint by Mr Wm. Moffat against a judgment of the Presbytery of Strathbogie. At a meeting of the Presbytery of Strathbogie, on the 31st of July 1866, the subject of receiving the visits of deputies appointed by the Assembly to visit certain Presbyteries in the Synod of Moray was taken up. It was moved that the deputation be cordially received; it was also moved that they be not received, for several reasons stated in the motion, such as, that the appointment of the deputation has all the appearance, though not articulately expressed, of a disrespectful and threatening reference to the Synod of Moray, and to the Presbytery, or certain members of it in particular; that, considering the character of the deputation, and the instructions on which it proposed to act, though not expressly endorsed by the Assembly, it appears to be grossly unconstitutional and illegal, arbitrary, inquisitorial, dictatorial, irresponsible, and without any rational excuse for its appointment, &c. The motion to receive the deputation was carried by 4 to 3 votes. Mr Moffat dissented and protested for leave

to complain to the Synod of Moray. The Synod, by a majority of 17 to 7, decided to refer the case *simpliciter* to the Assembly.

Mr Smellie, Elgin, and Mr Winter, Dyke, appeared to state the reference.

Mr WINTER read the resolution of last Assembly, appointing and instructing the deputies to visit the Synod of Moray, and said that the intelligence of this Act of Assembly had produced great dissatisfaction in some parts of the district of Moray, and in the Presbytery of Strathbogie among the rest. The Synod felt it was not for them to enter upon the discussion of the question on the point at issue between Mr Moffat and the Presbytery. They felt that though an inferior Court was entitled to enter upon or decide upon it, it was not so suitable or desirable or respectful to the General Assembly that they should do so. Their decision could not be final, and could not carry great weight in itself; and that was the simple reason why the Synod referred the matter to the Assembly.

Mr SMELLIE concurred in the statement of Mr Winter.

Parties having been removed,

Professor RAINY said—I rise for the purpose of proposing that the Assembly dismiss the reference, and I think the grounds for so doing are very plain and obvious. There are two elements in this case—the reference from the Synod of Moray, and an overture from the Presbytery of Forres—to be considered separately. The reason stated for the reference from the Synod was, that “the decision of this case depends mainly on the settlement of the question as to the lawfulness and expediency of these deputations.” Now, the Synod had nothing to do with the expediency of the deputation in the question that came before them, and we have nothing to do with it in deciding in this reference, though we might in the overture. For the question came in this way—whether the Presbytery of Strathbogie was justified in its procedure in receiving the deputation and concurring with them in the work they were called to perform? Mr Moffat objected to the Presbytery doing that, and appealed to the Synod. Now, the Synod had no business to meddle with the question of expediency in that form of it. They were quite free to come up with an overture to the Assembly if they had anything to say, and they should have sheltered the Presbytery of Strathbogie from being interfered with in its concurring with the deputations on such grounds as that stated. (Applause.) Then, as to the lawfulness—I am not going into abstractions about the foundation of jurisprudence—I think it is quite clear, as the case was pleaded from the bar, that when anybody chooses to say that compliance with an Act of Assembly in a certain thing raises questions about its lawfulness, and that question comes before the Synod, they ought to refer it to the Assembly. Now, I say, on the contrary, that there is no sort of appeal in regard to which a Synod should be more careful and more fully go into the case, and take care that they did nothing to encourage, at all events, needless and unfounded reasons, on any such appeal as that. They were bound clearly to have gone into the case, and they were called upon to shelter the Presbytery of Strathbogie on this point also. Mr Moffat made his objection on the ground of the unconstitutionality of the thing. Now, I have no doubt Mr Moffat made his objection most conscientiously, and, having mentioned his name, I must say I am sorry to propose a motion

depriving the Assembly of the pleasure of hearing him—(a laugh)—and I may be allowed to say, as a near neighbour of Mr Moffat, when I had a charge in that Presbytery, that though I was not always fortunate enough to agree with him, I never found a grain of malice remaining in his mind after our differences, and felt it a pleasant thing to go to his hospitable house and see him in mine. (Applause.) But I was going to say that surely this is a sort of appeal, especially when taken in the shape of refusing to allow the Presbytery to comply with the injunction of the Supreme Court of the Church—surely this is a sort of appeal which should be extremely clear indeed in its grounds. Now, it is quite unnecessary for us to decide the question whether in any sense of the word—in any single sense—the appointment of these deputies is unconstitutional,—surely it is clear that this General Assembly may appoint deputations to visit any Court, or Presbytery, or Synod for injunction, and surely the simple resolving, by the Act of Assembly, to appoint deputations to visit Synods in a certain order, is at all events not so clearly out of the order of competency, as that Presbyteries could be interfered with when disposed to comply with it. It is conceivable that when the Assembly had done a thing within its power, it might come out, that in the working of it out it interfered with something constitutional. By all means let the inferior court, then, come up by way of overture; and surely in a matter of this kind, it being competent for any Presbytery to visit a congregation, and any Synod to visit the Presbytery and the General Assembly to visit any inferior Court within its jurisdiction—if only they do not clothe the visitors with power to interfere with the constitutional working of the Courts below—surely the resolving to do that by an Act, whatever the effect or expediency, is not unconstitutional in any such sense as to warrant Mr Moffat's appeal, or to warrant the Synod to dispose of the appeal in the way of relieving the Presbytery of Strathbogie from the imputation of complying in an unconstitutional way with unlawful conduct of the Assembly. As to the other matter—I mean the overture from the Presbytery of Forres—in regard to that, I shall only say that, whether on the reference or on the overture, I should think it a very extraordinary thing of this General Assembly to find that last General Assembly did an unlawful or unconstitutional thing—on a single overture from a Presbytery. If we have to find that a past General Assembly did an unlawful and unconstitutional thing—so unlawful and unconstitutional that, *ipso facto*, it was null and void, and to be disregarded, so that even when a Presbytery is willing to comply, a single member can take them to the Synod to have them prevented, or even censured—I feel that we would need, before going into that view, to have a stronger testimony from the Courts below that there was ground for us to take such extraordinary action. But with regard to the matter itself, I have said that I regard it within the competency of any ordinary Court, and if the Assembly thought the state of religion throughout the Church constituted a good reason, I cannot see there was a shadow of a ground for saying that the General Assembly did an unconstitutional thing in resolving to send down such deputations in a series of years—at least until a future General Assembly shall find it is not expedient to continue that Act. Further, I hold very strongly the expediency of this deputation, for I believe it to be of great moment that the Assembly should testify to the people in the various dis-

tricts their interest, not merely in the organic working of the Church, but in the state of religion within the bounds of their subordinate jurisdiction; and if it were true that this visitation had been productive of some prejudicial effect, I should still feel bound to consider and inquire whether there was any evidence that the unhappy effect had been produced by the wish of the General Assembly to get at that element. When I say that, I have not the slightest wish to deny that this is a matter in which the General Assembly should be very desirous to take great care that, by no means—whether by the natural working of the matter, or by any exceptional circumstances connected with it—should any right be interfered with; and I think that if upon a fair and due trial there is not sufficient provision for guarding against evils of this kind, it will be very fitting for the inferior courts to come up by the way of overture to have the matter better regulated; but surely we would require something more than the overture of this single Presbytery to satisfy us that there is a ground to go upon, as we stand in regard to this matter. There is evidence in the act itself of the Assembly's care to guard the interests of the inferior court, for the deputations were specially instructed to confer with the Presbyteries of the bounds, and in concert with them to visit any congregation. That called upon the Presbytery to enter cordially into the matter, and if any Presbytery did not see its way to do that, it might very naturally follow that difficulties would arise; but otherwise the likelihood was, that no difficulty would be found in carrying out the objects of the Assembly. The reference in this case alludes to certain instructions which were given to the deputation. The Assembly appointed a small committee, along with the persons who composed the deputation, to draw up such instructions for their guidance as might seem suitable, and I understand that this is held to be an interference with the constitutional rights of the Presbyteries concerned. Now, it is quite clear that under the act these instructions could only be within the limits of the act itself. They could only be instructions to regulate the deputies in the discretionary sphere of their operations. There is nothing in the act to hinder the Presbytery from disregarding the instructions, and nothing to hinder the Synod from justifying them in doing so, if it turned out that they were instructions going beyond the proper and constitutional discretion of the deputation. That was part of the duty of the Synod. They should have seen if there was anything in the allegation. These are the grounds on which I do not think we can take any action on the ground of the overture, and why the reference of the Synod ought to be dismissed. If there is anything in the case the Synod should have sifted it, and what they should have done was to take great care that no person, on the mere pretext of questioning the lawfulness of an Act of the General Assembly, was in reality crossing and interfering with the execution of the Act. In conclusion, I have to state that if the Assembly sustains the reference, I do not see how any Act can ever be enforced at all, because it is clear that, on the ground stated, whenever anybody chooses to say he cannot conscientiously hold that Act lawful, instead of the Synod watchfully sifting the allegations, the party might take the same ground next year, and say our decision to-night was not lawful, and the Synod in the same way might come up next year to the Assembly.

Mr M^cCORKLE, St Niuians, said this case had evidently arisen out of a jealousy on the part of Presbyteries who thought they were over-ridden

by committees. The danger was, lest the duties of Presbyteries in regard to their congregations should be so far neglected or superseded by the appointment of such deputations.

Mr WOOD, Elie, seconded Dr Rainy's motion.

Mr BALFOUR, Holyrood, while thinking that there was not a *prima facie* case before the Synod for referring this matter to the Assembly, thought the Synod were justified, and had very good grounds for referring the constitutional question. He moved that the overture and the other matters should be taken up.

Dr G. G. BROWN thought Dr Rainy's motion was meant to kill two dogs with one stone. (A laugh.)

Dr RAINY—My motion is simply, dismiss the reference, and nothing is said about the overture. We are surely entitled to say nothing about the overture. That might be wise or not, but we are surely entitled to do it.

Mr BALFOUR moved that the Assembly dismiss the reference, but consider the overture, and any other matters connected with the appointment of Commissioners of the Assembly.

Dr G. G. BROWN seconded the motion.

Mr WOOD, Elie—Settle the question of the reference first before you take up the overture.

Dr Rainy's motion was then put to the House by the Moderator, and declared to be carried.

The MODERATOR—The reference is dismissed, and the overture is now in the hands of the Assembly.

Mr STARK, Greenock, proposed that the overture be taken up when it was proposed to appoint the deputations.

Mr BURNSIDE, Falkland, seconded the motion.

Mr BALFOUR moved that the overture be taken up at present.

Mr CRICHTON (elder) seconded the amendment.

Dr BUCHANAN hoped the Assembly would not take up the overture at the present late hour. The Assembly had sat late the last sederunt, and had to look forward to a late sederunt next day; and he asked Mr Balfour not to do anything unreasonable at that hour.

Mr BALFOUR—I do not wish to do anything unreasonable. I sat to the close of last night's sederunt, and will likely sit to the close of tomorrow's sederunt; but I will withdraw my motion if the House wish it—only, however, if a proper time be arranged for the discussion of the question, so that it should not be shelved.

Dr BUCHANAN—It is quite clear the House cannot just now fix the time for this question, as the report of the order of business was not before the House. But, of course, justice would be done to the case.

Mr BALFOUR—Then I withdraw my motion.

PASTORAL ADDRESS.

Mr WILSON, on behalf of a committee formerly appointed to prepare a pastoral address on prevailing errors, explained that as the address had not been issued, it was thought better to submit it in draft to the General Assembly for its sanction. He therefore asked that the committee should be authorised and instructed to print copies for circulation among members of the House, to be taken into consideration at a future diet.

The committee were authorised and instructed accordingly.

THURSDAY, MAY 30.

The Assembly met this morning at ten o'clock. The Hall was crowded in all parts.

THE UNION QUESTION.

The Assembly called for the Report of the Committee on Union.

There was laid on the table and read an extract minute from the records of the Synod of the United Presbyterian Church, along with a letter from the clerk of said Synod to the clerk of this Assembly.

An extract minute was also read from the records of the Synod of the Reformed Presbyterian Church.

The overtures on the subject of union being printed and in the hands of members, were held as read.

The Report of the Committee on Union being printed and in the hands of the members, was referred to by Dr Robert Buchanan, the Convener, who addressed the Assembly thereanent.

Dr BUCHANAN, who, on rising, was received with loud cheers, said :—The report on union among the Churches, which I have now laid on the table of the Assembly, has been for several days in the hands of the members, and will not, therefore, require any minute or lengthened exposition. Although the subject to which it relates is not now as fresh and new as when we took it up four years ago, it has not, on that account, lost anything of its intrinsic importance. It is only too possible, indeed, that not only may the keen interest with which it was at first regarded have been somewhat lessened by the lapse of time and by the frequency of the discussions which have taken place regarding it, but that feelings even of weariness and impatience may have arisen in many minds, on account of the entanglement and uncertainty in which the whole question has, every now and then, been apparently involved. No one, however, will allow himself to be much or long influenced by considerations like these, who truly and adequately realises the magnitude and the sacredness of the object at which this union movement aims.

That object is not a matter which we may prosecute or let alone just as we please. There are both principles and precepts in the Word of God by which we are imperatively required to keep it always in view. No enlightened Christian can look around him on the broken and divided condition of the Christian Church without being moved sorrowfully to say, "An enemy hath done this!" To rest satisfied with such a state of things, is to assume that it involves no sin—that it does no hurt to God's cause and no dishonour to His holy and blessed name; an assumption which is emphatically contradicted by the whole teaching of Scripture, and by the whole testimony of experience.

Of that ideal of the Church—not only as it is in heaven, but as it ought to be in this world—which Scripture sets before us, unity is beyond all question the most characteristic feature. It is a tree, it is a temple, it is a human body. It is a house, it is a city, it is a kingdom. It is described as having one Spirit, one hope, one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all. And no sooner had its members begun to fall out with each other, and to gather into separate sects and parties, than an inspired apostle was commissioned, with a voice of

earnest remonstrance and rebuke, to say, "Is Christ divided?—for whereas there is among you envying and strife and division, are ye not carnal, and walk as men?" To aim, therefore, at union among the Churches, at bringing together branches of the Church which, even in the same land, have been living for generations in separation and estrangement from one another, is a great duty lying upon God's people at all times—a duty in order to the fulfilment of which they are bound to seize every favourable opportunity which God in His providence may afford. I know that in saying this I am giving expression to a truth which no member of this Assembly would, for one moment, call in question. But I also know that it is a truth which, in dealing with the subject before us, is not always sufficiently borne in mind. I do earnestly hope, therefore, that in addressing ourselves once more, in this General Assembly, to the consideration of matters so high and sacred, we shall be enabled to do so in a fitting frame of mind—that we shall not allow our convictions of what ought to be done in this great business to be warped by local prejudice or personal feeling—that we shall endeavour to approach it and to look at it from that point of view in which it is presented by the Word of God.

I need scarcely say that, in using such language, I altogether disclaim the idea of seeking to bring to bear, on the decision of this question, any other influences but those which properly and rightfully belong to it. But, undoubtedly, the position we occupy in entering on this discussion is one of profound responsibility. That responsibility would have been great in any circumstances, but I am sure there is not a member of this Assembly who does not feel that responsibility to have been increased tenfold by the truly admirable tone of the discussions on this union question which have just taken place in the Synods of the Reformed Presbyterian and of the United Presbyterian Church. (Applause.)

In the more limited body of the Reformed Presbyterian Church, the harmony of sentiment and feeling, though not less gratifying, was perhaps less fitted to awaken surprise. But that in a body so large as the United Presbyterian Church, and which at one time seemed to be so widely removed and so unhappily estranged from us, there should have been exhibited such a seeing of eye to eye, and such oneness of heart and soul, on all that is most vital on the question of union between them and us, was truly wonderful, and cannot have failed to make a powerful and solemnising impression on every thoughtful Christian mind. (Applause.) I believe there were few among themselves, and few who were looking on, who have been able to resist the conclusion, that it was the doing of the Lord. All the more does it concern us this day to take heed to ourselves. Not merely upon the conclusions to which the discussion may bring us, but upon the very tone and spirit we give to the discussion itself, consequences of the greatest moment will depend; consequences that can hardly fail to tell powerfully, for good or evil, as the case may be, upon the welfare of all the Churches concerned, and upon the interests of vital religion in this land for generations to come. (Applause.)

Before going further in this opening address, it may be suitable and necessary that I should call the attention of the House to the precise stage which these union negotiations have now reached.

Twelve months ago, the committees of the several Churches had gone

over, both separately and conjointly, the whole of those matters of inquiry which their programme embraces. At that date, however, they had done so only in a preliminary way. Upon most of the matters in question they had, indeed, bestowed a large amount of careful investigation; but, at the same time, with the fully understood and expressly recorded intention of going over all of them again. Before entering, however, on the final revision of the findings at which they had arrived, they deemed it to be highly expedient and desirable that they should have before them any suggestions for their guidance which the Presbyteries of the several Churches might think it useful or needful to offer. The Supreme Courts of the different Churches having proved to be of the same opinion, and having in consequence taken last year the steps requisite for putting the Presbyteries in motion, numerous suggestions have been sent up to all the committees. With these suggestions fully in view, the work of revising the previous findings of the joint-committee has since been proceeded with, and the results, so far as the revision has gone, are given in the present report.

In this revised form the findings, under the first and second heads of the programme, are now before the Assembly. It is quite unnecessary for me to say how highly important the matters are to which these heads of the programme relate, both in their own nature and in the bearing they have on the question of union. Let me call the special attention of the House to the statements the report makes regarding those two great branches of the inquiry in which the committees have been engaged.

The first head of the programme, to which chiefly I intend to refer, deals, as is well known to the Assembly, with "the extent to which the Churches agree as to the province of the civil magistrate in relation to religion and the Christian Church." This, as every one competently acquainted with it knows, is both a large and a deeply important subject. And surely it cannot fail to be most gratifying to this Assembly to find, that after closely and carefully examining the entire field which that wide subject embraces, the committees have found that they differ in nothing save as to the one single point of setting up and endowing a civil establishment of religion. (Applause.) Let me ask the House to listen while I read the following "Articles of Agreement":—

"I. That civil government is an ordinance of God for His own glory and the public good: that to the Lord Jesus Christ is given all power in heaven and on earth; and that all men in their several places and relations, and therefore civil magistrates in theirs, are under obligation to submit themselves to Christ, and to regulate their conduct by His Word.

"II. That the civil magistrate ought himself to embrace and profess the religion of Christ; and though his office is civil and not spiritual, yet, like other Christians in their places and relations, he ought, acting in his public capacity as a magistrate, to further the interests of the religion of the Lord Jesus Christ among his subjects, in every way consistent with its spirit and enactments—(applause)—and that he ought to be ruled by it in the making of laws, the administration of justice, the swearing of oaths, and other matters of civil jurisdiction.

"III. That while the civil magistrate, in legislating as to matters within his own province, may and ought, for his own guidance, to judge

what is agreeable to the Word of God, yet, inasmuch as he has no authority in spiritual things, and as in these the employment of force is opposed to the spirit and precepts of Christianity, which disclaim and prohibit all persecution, it is not within his province authoritatively to prescribe a creed to his subjects, or to interfere with that government which the Lord Jesus Christ has appointed in His Church in the hands of Church officers, or to invade any of the rights and liberties which Christ has conferred on His Church, and which all powers on earth ought to hold sacred, it being the exclusive prerogative of the Lord Jesus to rule in matters of faith and worship.

“IV. That marriage, the Sabbath, and the appointment of days of national humiliation and thanksgiving, are practical instances to which these principles apply. 1. In regard to marriage, the civil magistrate may and ought to frame his marriage laws according to the rule of the Divine Word. 2. In regard to the Sabbath, the civil magistrate, recognising its perpetual obligation according to the rule of the Divine Word, especially as contained in the original institution of the Sabbath in the fourth commandment, and in the teaching and example of our Lord and His apostles, and its inestimable value in many ways to human society, may and ought, in his administration, to respect its sacred character, to legislate in the matter of its outward observance, and to protect the people in the enjoyment of the privilege of resting from their week-day occupations and devoting the day to the public and private exercises of divine worship. (Applause.) 3. The civil magistrate may, and, on all suitable occasions, ought to appoint days on which his subjects shall be invited to engage in acts of humiliation or of thanksgiving; but without authoritatively prescribing or enforcing any special form of religious service, or otherwise interposing his authority, beyond securing to them the opportunity of exercising their free discretion for these purposes.

“V. The Church and the State being ordinances of God, distinct from each other, they are capable of existing without either of them intruding into the proper province of the other, and ought not so to intrude. Erastian supremacy of the State over the Church, and Antichristian domination of the Church over the State, ought to be condemned; and all schemes of connexion, involving, or tending to either, ought to be avoided. The Church has a spiritual authority over such of the subjects and rulers of earthly kingdoms as are in her communion; and the civil powers have the same secular authority over the members and office-bearers of the Church as over the rest of their subjects. The Church has no power over earthly kingdoms in their collective and civil capacity, nor have they any power over her as a Church. But though thus distinct, the Church and the State owe mutual duties to each other, and, acting within their respective spheres, may be signally subservient to each other's welfare.

“VI. But the Church cannot lawfully surrender or compromise her spiritual independence for any worldly consideration or advantage whatsoever. And further, that the Church must ever maintain the essential and perpetual obligation, which Christ has laid on all His people, to support and extend His Church by free-will offerings.”

Such are the “articles of agreement” of the joint-union committee. As to every one of the many great and important questions which these comprehensive articles embrace, the four negotiating committees are

entirely at one, and the Churches they represent are also entirely at one.

I am quite aware it has sometimes been said, that though the committees were undeniably at one as to all these articles, the Churches were not agreed regarding them. To all such assertions or insinuations the late meetings of the Reformed Presbyterian and United Presbyterian Synods have put a conclusive end. The able, eloquent, and thorough discussions which in both these Synods have taken place regarding the Articles of Agreement, and the decisions they have so emphatically pronounced in favour of these articles, leave no room for further doubt or dispute on this subject.

There is a certain publication which some unknown benefactor most generously hands in at my door every month—(laughter)—in the April number of which there is an article headed, in conspicuous type, “Dr Buchanan on the Establishment Principle.” (Renewed laughter.) It consists all but entirely of extracts from a lecture of mine, written and published in Glasgow in 1835, amid the heats of an exciting controversy. I have no doubt the extracts were quite correctly made, though no copy of the invaluable original is now in my possession. These extracts have, I suppose, been raised up from the obscurity into which they had so undeservedly fallen—(renewed laughter)—and reproduced at this particular time as presenting, in contrast with some of my more recent utterances, one of those truly lamentable examples of human inconsistency and instability which are so common in these evil times in which it is our lot to live. (Loud laughter.) The article in question is, in short, a very perfect specimen of the *argumentum ad invidiam*—a very frequent and favourite style of argument with the periodical in which it occurs—(continued laughter and cheers)—a style of argument which, however much it may embitter a discussion, never really serves the interests of truth. (Cries of “Hear, hear,” and cheers.)

In this particular case, indeed, while the argument has all the inherent odiousness of the class to which it belongs, in so far as its spirit is concerned, it is, in itself, a simple and glaring absurdity. Let me ask the Assembly to look at it for a moment. It really deserves attention; not in the least, indeed, for its own sake, but for the sake of the light it indirectly throws on the true source and occasion of much of that prejudice and misapprehension with which, in many minds, the present union movement has had, and still has, to contend. In 1835, when my lecture was delivered, Voluntaryism was understood to mean what I then most strenuously opposed, and what I would oppose just as strenuously to-day. What that Voluntaryism was, the following extract from my lecture will sufficiently show. It contains the sum and essence of my whole argument against the views with which, on one side of the controversy, Voluntaryism was then identified. The extract runs thus :—

“In a word, if the Church Establishment doctrine were rejected, and the doctrine of Voluntaryism adopted in its stead, no bond could be formed between a nation and Him who is the God of nations. It is in this view of the Voluntary system that its atheistical spirit and tendency unequivocally appear. For if God’s authority and truth are not to be recognised by the king upon his throne, by legislators in the senate, by judges on the bench, by the statute-book in its laws—is it not

manifest that the nation, in that case, is placed in the position of practically disowning God? Civil government is expressly declared in Scripture to be God's own ordinance, and rulers are there pronounced to be His ministers for good unto the people; and yet, according to the Voluntary theory, the civil government must disown the very Being from whom its own authority is derived; rulers must disclaim all subordination to that King of kings and Lord of lords whose servants they themselves are. In a word, according to the Voluntary system, God must be virtually excluded from the government of His own world."

Now, Moderator, I am not able, at this distance of time, to say where we got our materials for drawing such a picture of Voluntaryism as that: but that undoubtedly was what we then supposed Voluntaryism to be. And I have not the least hesitation in saying that if such were the Voluntaryism of the present United Presbyterian Church, there could be no union between them and us. ("Hear, hear," and cheers.) Did any such gulf yawn between us, that Church and ours could not possibly come together. In the face of a difference so great and so vital, negotiations about union would never have been entered on at all. But what more has any man of candour and common sense to do than to lay the extract I have read alongside of the Articles of Agreement which are now on the table of the Assembly, and which have been so nobly vindicated and so heartily accepted by the United Presbyterian Synod, in order to see that, in the extract in question, I condemned nothing which the United Presbyterian Church does not in these articles condemn with equal clearness and force. (Prolonged applause.)

How the fact is to be accounted for that the Voluntaryism of the present day is so unlike and opposite to the Voluntaryism which my lecture described I hardly know, nor does it much concern me to find it out. If, like Frankenstein's monster, it was conjured into existence by incantations of our own; if it was the mere spectre of our nightmare dream—the raw head and bloody bones of an imagination distempered by the heats of an angry controversy—it was nevertheless a reality to us at the time. We fought with it as vehemently as if it had been veritable flesh and blood. (A laugh.) The truth is, I daresay, that for thinking so ill as we did of each other's position and principles in that memorable warfare, both we and our opponents were not a little to blame. ("Hear, hear," and applause.)

If the Voluntaries of those days used sometimes—as I am pretty sure they did—language which seemed, at least, logically to lead to the sort of conclusions we were accustomed to impute to them, I am just as sure that we, on our side, laid ourselves quite as open to misconstruction too. I am sure that we were by no means so careful as the subsequent Disruption controversy taught us to be, in defining the place and power we conceded to the civil magistrate in relation to religion and the Christian Church; and most especially am I sure that, in speaking of Church establishments and State endowments, we assigned to them a position of importance and indispensableness which we are very far from assigning to them now. (Cheers.) We were in the habit of talking about the State's duty to endow the Church in terms which could hardly fail to convey the idea that we believed it to be exclusively the State's duty—a duty with which the members of the Church had little or nothing to do. Nay, more—and I cannot, without a feeling of shame, recall the

fact, which must be fresh in the memory of many now hearing me—we were accustomed to ridicule the language of our opponents, the Voluntaries, when they spoke of it as a privilege that the people should be called on to give of their own money to uphold the ordinances of God. Yes; many a foolish and heartless sneer upon that subject was uttered in those days, which not even the most extreme anti-Voluntary would allow himself to utter now. It is not for either party, therefore, to be throwing stones at the other. Each party, I believe, looked at its own position by far too exclusively from one side, and the result was, that the differences between us appeared to be far more and greater than they really were.

Time and the course of events have, happily, allowed the blinding dust raised by that fierce controversy to fall, and have placed both parties in a much more favourable position for calmly and candidly reconsidering the whole question in dispute. And the consequence is, that, to the genuine surprise of many, and to the great joy of all, we now find that our agreement is immensely greater, and our difference inconceivably less, than we once imagined them to be.

If, by reminding me of the strong things I said about Voluntaryism in 1835, the periodical to which I have referred means to say that I am chargeable with gross inconsistency in now warmly befriending union with the United Presbyterian Church, the answer is as simple as it is conclusive; and it is this: I befriend the proposed union just because I find that not only has the United Presbyterian Church no sympathy whatever with the kind of Voluntaryism I then condemned, but that, on the contrary, as regards the great question of the subjection of nations and their rulers to Christ, and of their obligation to embrace, profess, and further His holy religion in every way consistent with its spirit and enactments, and to frame their laws and regulate their conduct by His Word, they and I are entirely at one. (Great applause.) I do hope, therefore, that we shall have no more of that sort of thing in future. (Renewed cheering.) Unfair and unmanly, however, as I think it to be, I really would have taken no notice of it here, but for the opportunity it afforded of arresting the attention of the Assembly and of the Church on the important fact, that upon matters of the greatest moment connected with the subject before us, on which the Churches now negotiating were supposed to be at utter variance in 1835, they are shown by the report on our table, and still more conclusively by the recent vote of the United Presbyterian Synod, to be actually and entirely at one.

It is quite true, that while this large amount of agreement has been clearly ascertained to exist among all the negotiating Churches with respect to the first head of the programme, it also distinctly appears, as I have already stated, that there is something in which they differ, and I am as far as possible from wishing that this difference should be overlooked. It must not be overlooked. It cannot be overlooked. There is now an absolute necessity that we should set it fully and clearly before us. We knew, indeed, from the very first that this difference existed. I myself, in moving the appointment of the Union Committee in 1863, and Dr Charles Brown, in seconding that motion, made pointed allusion to this very difference, and plainly indicated that, in our view at least, it was not enough, in and of itself, to justify the Churches then

about to enter on these union negotiations in remaining apart from one another.

In all that can be properly regarded as doctrine, regarding the civil magistrate's province in relation to the Church, we are at one. We differ only as to a particular application of the doctrine. The distinction between these two things is very great, and is admirably brought out in his historical theology, by Dr Cunningham, in a passage in which he takes occasion with his usual clearness of discrimination to say: "The first question is this—Does an obligation to promote the welfare of true religion and the prosperity of the Church of Christ attach to nations as such, and to civil rulers as representing them and as regulating their affairs? And if this question be settled in the affirmative, as we think it ought to be, then we have next to consider, In what way or by what means ought the duty to be discharged?"

Now, manifestly, on the first and fundamental question here put, our Reformed Presbyterian friends and our United Presbyterian friends go completely along with Dr Cunningham. In the broad general doctrine he has in that question laid down they entirely concur. They expressly and explicitly declare along with us that "the civil magistrate ought to embrace and profess the religion of Christ;" and that "he ought, acting in his public capacity as a magistrate, to further the interests of the religion of the Lord Jesus Christ among his subjects in every way consistent with its spirit and enactments." They frankly accept, therefore, Dr Cunningham's first and fundamental proposition.

When he advances beyond that point, what does he say? Let me ask the Assembly to mark his words when he goes on to his next question: "In what way or by what means ought the duty to be discharged?" Upon this second question he says—"There is room for considerable difference of opinion, both with respect to what may lawfully be done with that view, and what is naturally fitted as a means to effect that end; while it is also plain that, in regard to some of the topics comprehended in the general subject, the particular condition of the nation or community at the time may very materially affect or determine both what is practicable and what it is expedient to do in the matter."

Dr Cunningham, it thus appears, was not afraid to say that, as to what may "lawfully" be done by the civil magistrate, in the way of promoting the welfare of true religion and the prosperity of the Church of Christ, "there is room for considerable difference of opinion." (Applause.) Yes, "room for considerable difference of opinion." Dr Cunningham, in other words, made a broad distinction between the great general doctrine that an obligation lies on nations as such, and on civil rulers as representing them, to promote the welfare of true religion and the prosperity of the Church of Christ, and the application of that doctrine in the way of deciding as to the particular methods by which it is to be carried into practical effect. To the recognition of the general doctrine he attached the highest importance; touching, as it directly does, the great question of Christ's Headship over the nations, and of their subjection to Him and to His Word. A difference of view as to the means which it may be warrantable to take in applying that doctrine, he regarded, on the other hand, as of comparatively inferior

moment. The one he looked upon as substantially a question *de fide*; the other he considered as standing on the much lower level of a question of interpretation; and hence, with his usual masculine common sense and genuine candour, he admitted without hesitation that there was room at this point "for considerable difference of opinion"—room, in short, for an open question. (Loud cheers.)

But more than this. It so happens that we have recorded evidence of the precise conclusion to which these views of Dr Cunningham would have carried him, in disposing of that great question of union among the Churches which is now before us, had he been alive and in the midst of us this day. Not long after the Disruption, and more than twenty years ago, he published the statement I am now about to read. First, he laid down the general proposition, "That with the views we entertained we could not say that we never could in any circumstances enter into alliance with the State and receive State assistance." I suppose there is not a man in this Assembly who is not prepared to say the same thing. None of us would say, or could say—with the views we entertain—that in no conceivable circumstances whatever would we become an Established Church. If union with the other Churches were impossible, except on the footing of our thus forestalling the whole possible future of opinions and events, and binding ourselves by such a peremptory declaration as Dr Cunningham describes, the prospect of union, so far as we are concerned, would, of course, have to be abandoned. But for any such declaration no demand has been, or is in the least likely, by any of the Churches, to be made. Having then, put such a declaration aside, as obviously inadmissible and unreasonable, Dr Cunningham goes on to deal with this very question of union, as if, with almost prophetic insight, he had foreseen, in 1844, the exact state of things we have to face in 1867; and surely the fact that he was then giving his judgment on this question, under no bias or preoccupation of mind, such as the existing discussion might be supposed to create among some of us, ought to give that judgment peculiar weight and force. Continuing the statements, the first of which I have already quoted, he proceeds thus:—

"2. That we never would receive such assistance upon any terms or conditions, expressed or understood, which were in the least inconsistent with the free and full exercise of all our rights and liberties as a Church of Christ.

"3. That we could scarcely conceive anything more improbable than that the rulers of Great Britain, or of any of the kingdoms of this world, would be willing to give assistance and support to a Church upon terms and conditions with which it would be lawful for a Church of Christ to comply, and that this improbability was so great as practically to amount, in our judgment, to an impossibility.

"4. That even if the State were to make to us proposals which, viewed in themselves, involved nothing that was, in our apprehension, inconsistent with the full recognition of all our rights and liberties as a Church of Christ, we would attach very great weight, in deciding upon them, to the consideration of the way and manner in which our acceptance or refusal would bear upon our relation to the other Churches of Christ—(cheers)—as there is good reason to believe that the maintenance of a strict relation between the Churches of Christ in a community would

have a far more important bearing upon the interests of religion and the welfare of Christ's people than anything the civil power could do." (Applause.)

I have produced these statements in this Assembly, as I did on another occasion elsewhere, not only because of the high consideration that is due to them, as coming from the man who was at once our profoundest theologian, and the ablest expounder, and most powerful vindicator of our Free Church principles—(cheers)—but because they lie so directly in the line of the argument I am addressing to the House.

The other negotiating Churches most reasonably wish, at the stage at which we have arrived, to know what we intend to make of that particular point of difference between by much the largest of these Churches and ourselves which is now clearly seen to exist. If we make so much of it as to be of opinion that its existence is incompatible with the projected union, now is the time to say so. (Hear, hear.) To have formed that conviction, and yet to conceal it and keep it back, in the circumstances in which we are placed, is impossible. (Applause.) To continue these eventful negotiations with a foregone conclusion fatal to their whole object and issue already in our minds, would be not merely an inexcusable folly, but an outrage upon all honourable feeling. (Loud cheers.) Brought, therefore, as we thus evidently are, into a position that compels us to look in the face the difference to which I have alluded, I, for my part, am glad to know what such a man as Dr Cunningham would have thought and said upon the subject.

Now, the statements which I have read show, beyond all question, that his mind was made up twenty years ago, and made up altogether apart from any pressure or exigency of the moment, as to these three things:—First, that the rights and liberties of the Church of Christ must be preserved at all hazards, and that no sort of State connexion which, even by the remotest implication, imperilled them, ought ever to be entered into by this Free Church. Second, that it is nothing less than visionary to expect that the rulers of any nation in Christendom will afford a civil establishment of religion to any true Church of Christ on really scriptural terms. (Hear, hear.) And therefore, that to refuse to go into a union with other Churches, in itself right and desirable, merely for the sake of keeping open a contingency as to State connexion so improbable as to amount to an impossibility, would be an act of flagrant folly, if not something far worse. (Loud cheers.) And, third, that even if a State connexion were offered to us by which these rights and liberties were completely guaranteed, it would still be our bounden duty to consider what effect our accepting such a civil establishment would have upon our relation to the Churches of Christ around us. (Applause.)

If our taking such a step were of necessity to set us at variance with these other Churches, and to make union with them impossible, or to break up a union already formed—and if it were to breed perpetual dispeace and jealousy between them and us—Dr Cunningham would, in that event, have regarded the position of an Establishment as not worth the purchasing at so great a price—(loud cheers)—it being his decided conviction that there is nothing which State favour and patronage can do for the interests of religion, and for the welfare of Christ's people, at all to counterbalance that which they would lose by the hin-

dering or the breaking up of a right relation among the Churches of Christ themselves. (Renewed cheers.)

If anything more than these explicit statements be needed to enable us to ascertain how Dr Cunningham would have decided the question which God in His providence is this day placing before us, another sentence from the same remarkable document will suffice :—"The question," he finally says, "of National Establishments is, with the views and in the circumstances of the Free Church, a purely theoretical one; and of this I feel confident, that before the period come, if it ever come, when the rulers of Great Britain shall make to the Free Church proposals which she could for a moment entertain, the Churches of Christ in that country will have attained to such a unity of sentiment, and such a cordiality of affection for each other, as to secure united and harmonious action in regard to all important matters that may bear upon the welfare of each and all of them."

And what is this but to say, what must be self-evident to every thoughtful mind, that if the all but unimaginable contingency spoken of should really come to pass—if so marvellous a change should be wrought, within any period about which we need to concern ourselves, upon the people and parliament of this kingdom, as that they should be of one heart and one soul as to the true doctrine, worship, discipline, and government of the Church of Christ—that marvellous work of grace upon the State must be contemporaneous with, or rather the fruit of, such an outpouring of the Spirit of God upon the Churches of Christ themselves, that the path of duty to all of them could not be otherwise than so plain as to make disagreement and disunion impossible? (Applause.)

Such, Moderator, are the views upon the question which, in one form or another, we shall have this day to dispose of, that were pronounced by that eminent man by anticipation, so to speak, two and twenty years ago. Without knowing, or at any rate, without at all remembering that Dr Cunningham had written the statements I have now quoted, I had myself, after a careful and earnest consideration of the whole subject, arrived at the very conclusions these statements set forth. When, therefore, my attention was recently called to them, I need hardly say that it afforded me a satisfaction of the liveliest kind—a satisfaction in which I cannot doubt that the overwhelming majority of this Assembly will be found to share. (Applause.)

I have dwelt so long on this branch of the subject—which, indeed, is the one at present of the most special and pressing importance—that I shall not detain the Assembly long with any of the other matters to which the report I have laid on the table refers. As regards the second head of the programme, it will be seen from the report that all those important doctrines of the gospel with which it deals have again been made the subject of full and earnest conference in the joint-committee, and with the same result as last year. A motion was, indeed, made in the committee, that their finding should take a different form, and should be expressed in the following words :—"That the committee are agreed that Jesus Christ, in the purpose of the Father, and in His own intention, offered Himself to satisfy Divine justice only for the sins of the elect." This motion, however, which was supported only by the mover, Dr Wood, and the seconder, Dr Gibson, was not adopted, for reasons which appear

in the following decision to which the committee came :—“ The committee having resumed consideration of the second head of the programme, and having held a lengthened conference on the subject, decline to adopt the foregoing motion, on the twofold ground, that it is not a full and adequate statement of the doctrine of the Confession of Faith on the great subject to which it refers, and because it would involve the Committee in the unwise and unsafe course of substituting, in a formal official deliverance, other language than that of the Confession of Faith itself, in setting forth the doctrines which the Churches represented in the joint-committee hold. And further, as the result of this renewed conference, the committee resolve to adhere to the finding on this head of the programme which they reported to the Supreme Courts of the negotiating Churches last year, as follows :—‘ That, in regard to the doctrines on which alone the joint-committee had seen it necessary to call for explanations, the joint-committee found, with lively satisfaction, that, holding as all the Churches represented in the joint-committee do, the Westminster Confession of Faith as their common standard, they were in entire harmony as to the views which that Confession gives of the teachings of the Word of God.’ ”

It is quite true that, in the course of the conference whose results the finding I have now read embodies, it came out this year—as it had done last year—that a certain difference existed as to what bearing, if any, the infinite sufficiency of Christ’s atonement has on the free offer of salvation which the gospel makes to sinners of mankind at large—a difference, however, not peculiar to any one of the committees, but existing, more or less, within each and all of them.

On this subject, it will be remembered by many members of the House that a truly admirable statement was made by Principal Fairbairn in last Assembly, in which he most clearly showed that the difference turned on a point as to which the Confession of Faith has given no deliverance. The Confession, he said—and, as he thought, most wisely—had viewed the redemptive work of Christ in the light of the divine intention towards the elect, and as to everything bearing on that view of it had been full and explicit, while it had maintained a marked reserve as to all besides. Dr Fairbairn regarded the attitude which the Confession had thus taken up, in dealing with the unspeakably profound subject of the Atonement, as truly wise on two grounds :—The one, that the view of this subject which it presents is the strictly proper one for a Confession, as being the one with which the members of the Church have directly to do, as all professing to be partakers of redemption, and as that which constitutes the ground of their fellowship and of their hopes as believers ; the other, that it is the view on which alone the Scriptures furnish adequate materials for doctrinal statements. It was his judgment, accordingly, that “ in speaking of the work of Christ in relation to sinners generally, or to men as not certainly known to belong to the elect, the whole that can be required of any one is, that he do not use language which, either directly or by plain implication, contravenes the statements in the Confession as to particular redemption.” “ To push doctrine,” he added, “ or to require consent further, were virtually to make a new Confession.” (Applause.)

I was much interested to observe that in addressing, a fortnight ago,

his own Synod on this very point, Dr Goold—(loud applause)—a man held most justly in the highest esteem, both for the soundness of his judgment and for the soundness of his theology—(renewed applause)—took up precisely the same position. “The question, be it carefully noted,” he said, “is not in reference to the absolute efficacy of the atonement in regard to the elect. On this point there is complete agreement. Nor is the question in relation to the infinite sufficiency of the atonement. Nor does the question refer to the universal offer of the gospel. On this point also the agreement is as complete. Nor does it refer to a point on which the most orthodox divines have differed, namely, whether the universality of the offer depends on the simple command of God, or on the infinite merit of the Cross. In the Churches represented in the conference there were some who took the one ground and some who took the other, and some who took both as the basis of an indiscriminate call. The one point really before us was, whether a certain sentence in the Confession warranted the belief that satisfaction to divine justice in the death of Christ includes a provision for a universal offer of the gospel.” Having thus singled out and set forth the one point on which the discussion and the difference turned, Dr Goold added this—“My own impression is, that the difference of view lies outside of the Confession, and is not strictly determined by any sentence contained in it.”

For myself I am thoroughly convinced that this is the real state of the case; and that, in so far as the second head of the programme is concerned, there is not the shadow of a ground why the negotiating Churches should not become one. Heresy may break out in any or in all of our Churches; but what other or better human security can we have for either keeping it out, or putting it out, than the honest and unflinching exercise of discipline, based on a *bona fide* adherence to a common Confession of Faith? (Applause.)

On this very subject of adherence to the Confession, it is well known that no little ado was made in some quarters about the terms in which that adherence is, by some of the Churches, expressed. The language used by the United Presbyterian Church, for example, in her formula, and in the questions put to office-bearers at ordination, is considerably different from ours, and even from that of the former Secession Church. As this diversity of language had given rise, in some minds, to doubts as to whether it was intended to convey some diversity of meaning, the attention of the joint-committee was formally called to the subject by the committee of the Free Church. The result of the conversation regarding it which in consequence took place was exactly what was to have been expected. Not only did the United Presbyterian committee assure us that their form of adherence to the Confession meant exactly what ours meant, but they added, that, so far as they knew and believed, their Church would be quite willing to go back to the Old Secession form of adherence, which was almost identical in terms with our own. (Applause.)

To the subject of State Endowments I hope the Assembly will allow me for a moment to return before sitting down. As regards the action we are now to take, that subject is really the point in hand. If it is not to be an open question, these union negotiations must now, obviously, and at once, come to an end. That the United Presbyterian Church differed with us on this subject we knew all along. At any rate no one

can be ignorant of it now. Very many, indeed, imagined that, on the great question of the province of the civil magistrate in relation to religion and the Christian Church, we differed to an immensely greater extent than, as it now clearly appears, we actually do. In dissipating these misconceptions and misunderstandings, and in bringing clearly into view the thorough agreement that exists between us as to all that is most vital on the subject of the relations and the responsibilities of nations and their rulers to the Lord Jesus Christ and to His Church and kingdom, the conferences of the joint-union committee have achieved a great work for the cause of both truth and peace.

On that great subject we have brought our difference to a minimum. After sifting for four years the whole question "as with a sieve," the residuum of difference that remains is neither more nor less than this, that we think there are circumstances and conditions under which it might be lawful for the State to set up and support, with the national resources, a civil establishment of religion, and that there are circumstances and conditions under which the Church may lawfully accept such a position; whereas our United Presbyterian friends hold an opposite opinion.

We admit, indeed, without reserve, that there is not, at this moment, a Church Establishment in the whole world in whose case the conditions and circumstances we hold to be necessary to its lawfulness are actually realised. We also admit that, with the one solitary exception of the Church of Scotland, there has never been, since the days of Constantine, even one specimen of the ideal we contend for. (Applause.) We admit, still further, that, in so far as that ideal was reached and realised in the case of our own ancestral Church, it was at the expense of a struggle in which the ideal was again and again destroyed, and that now it exists no more. We admit, yet again, that in the now religiously-divided state of this country, whose Legislature and Government are made up of Jews and Christians, of Protestants and Papists, of Prelatists and Presbyterians, of Churchmen and Dissenters, of believers and unbelievers, it is practically impossible to realise the state of things in which alone a Church Establishment, of the only kind we could recognise as scriptural and lawful, could be formed. I believe that we could get an endowment to-morrow if we were content to accept it alongside of the Popish Church. That is the very thing which is before this Church as a temptation and a snare; and that is the very danger that is looming in the distance, and threatening all the Churches of the kingdom. If we would only say to the Legislature, "Oh, yes, set up an Irish Popish Church, but give us a share of the endowment," we might be quite sure of a most favourable answer. But I hope that, instead of ever looking in that direction—(applause)—much less instead of consenting that we should ever have anything like such a connexion—we shall be prepared to say to the Legislature, "Rather down with all Church Establishments in the kingdom." (Loud and prolonged cheering, which rendered inaudible the next sentence uttered by Dr Buchanan.) But still, along with all these admissions, we believe that a lawful and scriptural Church Establishment is theoretically possible; whereas, on the other hand, and as I have already said, our United Presbyterian friends are of opinion that, under no circumstances and no conditions, ought such an arrangement to take place.

This is the whole amount of our difference ; and, on their side at least, it is only a difference of individual opinion. Their view upon the subject is not embodied in their creed. It has no place in their testimony as a Church. It is not with them a term of communion, and they disclaim both the intention and the wish to make it such. The question, therefore, is—Do we mean to insist that our view of the subject shall be a term of communion in any Church into which we enter ? Do we mean to insist on the recognition of a principle which is not only of subordinate importance in itself, but to which there is no reasonable prospect of our being now called upon to give practical effect, even at the expense of making union with other Christian Churches impossible ? Is actual union among the Churches of Christ to be of less account in our eyes than a barely possible union between our Church and the civil power ? I will not suffer myself to believe that the Church of the Disruption—a Church which has itself found, from trying and bitter experience, that only by casting its State connexion to the winds could it retain its spiritual freedom—will ever commit an act of folly so great. Till I actually see it, I will never believe that our Church can be so inexcusably and so fatally blind to the signs of the times.

If there be anything to which those signs point more clearly than to another, it is to the imperative and hourly-increasing necessity that lies on all Churches that hold the Head, and that know and love the truth as it is in Jesus, to draw closer together. How are the Nonconformist Presbyterian Churches of our native land, with their present divided counsels and broken ranks, to resist the onset of the forces of error and evil that are gathering on every side ? Are we not straining at a gnat and swallowing a camel, when we allow a difference on the purely theoretical question, as to what ought to be done by the civil power, to outweigh and overmatch in our estimation the many great, pressing, and practical questions about which we are all agreed, and which have so direct a bearing on the present duty of the Churches themselves ? (Applause.) The example of the nations might well read, on this subject of union, a great lesson to the Churches of Christ. Not merely the sagacity of their statesmen, but the instincts of the nations themselves, are teaching them that if they are to live at all amid the gigantic conflicts of modern times, they must give up their intestine jealousies and divisions, and rally around the flag of their common fatherland. Sardinia and the two Sicilies, Piedmont and the Papal States, Tuscany and Lombardy, must lay aside their old alienations and enmities, and become one united Italy. The fragmentary kingdoms, and princedoms, and palatinates of the Teutonic race must gather themselves into one great German people, if they are to have even a chance of national existence. Strange and ominous it will indeed be if no similar sagacity and no similar instincts should be heard speaking loudly and earnestly, in this great crisis of their history, to the Churches of Christ. If little wars have come to an end on the theatre of the political world, it seems hardly less evident that on the theatre of the religious world they are passing away too ; and that here, also, great wars—wars of Catholic magnitude—are awaiting the defenders of Christian truth. (Hear, hear.) God grant that there may be found among us, in view of such a future, men who have understanding of the times, and who know what Israel ought to do. (Loud and prolonged cheering.)

Rev. Dr RAINY.—I appear here under very peculiar circumstances. Our beloved friend Dr Candlish, although under no degree of indisposition in the least fitted to create any alarm, has found himself quite unable to introduce the motion of which he gave notice. This Assembly has been for Dr Candlish a trying and a remarkable one, for it has fallen on a time of domestic distress; and yesterday he had to leave Edinburgh for the purpose of being present at the funeral of his only grandchild. Notwithstanding this circumstance, his feeling in connexion with this matter was so strong that he was thoroughly prepared to throw the whole weight of his influence and of his genius into the pleadings on behalf of the motion of which he gave notice. It was very much because it was felt that this must impose a heavy burden on him that it was felt not right that he should be burdened with the fatigue and anxiety of looking after the previous heavy case before this Assembly. (Hear.) To my dismay, sir, when I arrived here this morning, at half-past ten o'clock, I was encountered by a message conveyed to me from Dr Candlish by Dr Buchanan, asking me to introduce the motion to the Assembly in his room.

I had come here, sir, having made up my mind a considerable time ago on this subject—with my mind very much discharged of all those topics which naturally fall to be introduced and considered in this connexion; only looking forward, as we have all been doing, I daresay, whatever view we take, to the pleasure of hearing Dr Candlish rising to the height of this great argument, carrying the Court along with him. I had simply been asked to take charge of a few small matters on which it might happen that a member of the union committee ought at an advanced stage of the discussion to make explanations, and which might not so suitably be touched upon in the opening address—at all events, I was just prepared for that, and prepared to say as little as possible, so that there might be more room for other members of the Assembly to speak. And now, sir, feeling, as I am sure we all do, the importance of the bearing of our proceedings to-day on the question of union and of those negotiations for union with the other Churches—feeling how decidedly our proceedings to-day must affect this, and therefore must affect history—feeling how our proceedings this day are looked at by all those in Presbyterian Churches everywhere who are entering with intelligence and earnestness into the state of our common Presbyterianism and our common Christianity—I am sure the Assembly must feel that I am in a position that is very unenviable.

And yet, sir, I must say that there is one consideration present to my mind that prevents me from feeling the position so overwhelming as, in view of the greatness of the subject, I otherwise should feel it to be. We cannot have to-day, sir, what we expected. We cannot have our matchless friend filling our hearts and our minds with those great considerations which, as we all acknowledge, come into view, and must weigh with us this day. We cannot have not only the strength of his arguments, but the tone to our whole debate, which it would have been such a precious thing to have had from him. Neither can we have our beloved friend Dr Bannerman, who has taken such an interest in this matter, to take part in this matter as a member of Assembly. He, too, although under no indisposition that imperils his permanent services to the Church, is in circumstances that would make it not prudent for

him to be here to-day. Sir, I feel—I know you will all feel—as my speech goes on (and I shall try to make it as short as I can)—the melancholy contrast between what it must be and what the speech in support of the motion might have been. But all the more you will feel that our Lord Jesus Christ is here—that He has put away what might possibly have intercepted our attention from His presence and from His watchfulness over us. He is present, and He will take care of all of us, and will take care of all parties as they express their views,—as we honestly compare our opinions. As we go through the debate before us He will raise us above what is personal and petty, and will give a tone to our discussion, will lift us above mere prejudice and mere passion, will guide us, whatever the result, so to arrive at it as that we shall have cause, when the day is ended, to give thanks for something far better than the presence of any man, whatever his gifts and whatever his graces. I have now to introduce the following motion, viz. :—

“The General Assembly approve of the report, and express their grateful satisfaction with the large measure of agreement under the first head of the programme, as well as with the reiterated assurance of entire agreement under the second head. Further, the General Assembly, being more than ever impressed with the duty and importance of aiming at a cordial union among all the Disestablished branches of the Church of Scotland, reappoint the committee with the former instructions. And being of opinion, as at present advised, that as regards the first head of the programme, considered in itself, there appears to be no bar to the union contemplated, the General Assembly, while reserving final judgment on the whole case and every part thereof, direct the committee to give their earnest attention to the other heads of the programme, especially those which deal with the worship, government, and discipline of the Church, and with those important practical questions which relate to property and finance.”

Now, sir, in calling the attention of the Assembly to what this motion proposes, I have the great advantage of having been preceded by Dr Buchanan in his most admirable address, and therefore feel myself relieved from dwelling much on some of the topics that are here presented to us. But you will see that there are two points that deserve to be singled out as likely to be considered to embrace the gist of this resolution. One of these is the leading and the emphatic one—“That, as regards the first head of the programme, considered in itself, there appears to be no bar to the union contemplated.” That, I believe, is the great subject of this day’s consultation and debate. At the same time, there is another matter introduced into the motion in the first instance, where the Assembly expresses its grateful satisfaction with the large measure of agreement under the first head of the programme, as well as with the reiterated assurance of entire agreement under the second head. The second head is there referred to in terms of satisfaction with the committee’s agreement on that head.

I have said, sir, and I repeat it, that I believe the question on which we have to decide to-day, and the true issue before us, regards the first head of the programme. I should have thought it almost unnecessary to refer to the other, were it not that we are aware that there has been an indication of dissatisfaction in connexion with some recent proceedings in the committee from two respected members of the committee,

and it may or may not come forward in to-day's debate. Now, with respect to this, what I have to say is this. My position on the subject is this:—I am satisfied that upon that question—and I think I have been present at all the meetings of the committee in which it came up—the doctrine held, and set forth, and explained to us with singular fulness and frankness by the United Presbyterian members of the committee on union, is, in its whole substance, identical with the doctrines of the Confession of Faith. Further, as regards any diversity that there may be in regard to the choice of expressions, and the ways of extricating some matters in connexion with the bearing that the death of Christ may have on mankind, sinners in general, and as such, to whom the gospel is to be preached; that as to that, what they set before us, as their whole meaning on that head, can be proved to be in effect, as they explain it to us, identical with the position taken up by a whole catena of divines of the Church of Scotland, and of the early secessionists of acknowledged orthodoxy, and well known as defenders of truth and orthodoxy on the subject of the atonement; while, at the same time, there is room for a difference of opinion, which it is quite fit that theologians should feel and entertain and discuss in a friendly manner, as to the wisdom of expressions chosen, and as to the degree of weight to be laid, on the one hand, or on the other hand, on certain positions that all admit.

I think, sir, this is the position that I am prepared to defend and instruct. I have my own view as to what are the safe and desirable modes of expressing those matters, and I don't pretend to say that I am agreed as to that with all the ministers of our own Church—(hear, hear)—nor with all the ministers of the United Presbyterian Church, but I am prepared to say that I am thoroughly persuaded that what lies at the bottom of it all, and what has come out again and again and again, is a difference merely in the form of expressing the matter, and in the degree of weight laid upon certain points; that it goes no further, and that it is in vain that you try to make anything more of it, or to formulate it into anything that does not disappear under your hands.

I thought it right to express myself so far on this point in moving a motion of this kind, but then I repeat that I think the real issue before us bears upon the first head of the programme. We say, that, reserving judgment on the whole case, still, as at present advised, as regards the first head of the programme, considered in itself, there appears to be no bar to the union contemplated. Now, as to that qualification, "considered in itself," I may have a word to say before I am done; but in coming to look at the question whether there is or is not a bar to union under this first head of the programme, I must ask the House again to turn their earnest attention to the singular importance of the articles on which we are all agreed, and which have been read in your hearing.

Surely all of us, whatever motion we are ultimately to support, acknowledge the importance, the inestimable value of the Articles of Agreement, vindicated in that noble debate in the Synod of the United Presbyterian Church. It completely extricates the whole Presbyterianism of Scotland from all Voluntaryism, that is, mere political Voluntaryism, or that is of the nature of irreligious and infidel Voluntaryism. ("Hear, hear," and applause.) It makes it for ever impossible to re-establish again the confusion on that point, which, by the nature of the position in which men and Churches were placed,

it was hardly possible to get rid of twenty or thirty years ago. It brings out an amount, a mass of agreement on the great fundamentals that bear upon the duty of the magistrate in relation to Christ, which, I think, we are bound to accept, and which all parties among us shall surely accept with most unfeigned and most sincere thankfulness.

I think we owe it to our United Presbyterian friends—or rather, as I believe they would tell us, to God's good providence and grace that has done it—to express our sympathy with them in the process to which they have been called. Consider how the former treatment of this question had been entangled. Consider how, in the voluntary controversy, the positions that we laid down, even when they were not exaggerated, as it cannot be denied that as to some parts of them and some ways of expounding them they were exaggerated—that the positions we laid down were entangled with the question as to what the way was in which these principles were to be applied; and consider the strong hold which this idea took upon the minds of our friends of that Church, that there was implied in our principles, so soon as they came to be extricated and worked out, an inevitable interference with the liberty of conscience and with the liberty of the subject. Let us consider how natural it would have been for men to do, what in this question of union it is so natural for men of all Churches to do—to assume a precautionary attitude, and stand off, and say, “Well, I do not know what will come of agreeing to certain things, and allowing them to stand. I shall be very cautious as to what I admit on that subject, and I refuse to make admissions.” How naturally, how reasonably it might be said, that there must be difficult questions, as I have no doubt there are, as to the way in which even these Articles of Agreement are to be worked out in the various circumstances in which, practically, nations and civil rulers may be placed; and I ask, Is it not something worthy of a Christian Church to see how frankly and magnanimously our friends have approached this subject, and how they have been led and guided to a conclusion, with regard to it, which opens so far before us a prospect, or rather which reduces the whole question to a very circumscribed one, however important, with which we have to deal to-day? (Applause.)

I ask, whatever be the views of duty that most ultimately regulate the decisions of the members of this House, is there no possibility that may well make us cautious and anxious in applying our views of duty—is there no possibility of throwing this result away? Is there no possibility of things taking such a course as shall give a singular advantage to those in Scotland—and there are those in Scotland—who will be ready to say to our United Presbyterian friends, “Well, then, you see there is no use in taking up that ground unless you are prepared to go the whole length of civil establishments in religion, as a thing which Christ intended and meant to promote in connexion with His Church; and if you are not prepared to go that length, you must seek your natural allies and your natural associates in another quarter.” I think this must make us anxious as to the way in which we are to formulate our principles, and apply them to this question. It must fill us with a strong desire to find, if possible, that there is a way of getting over what might seem to be a bar to union. It must fill us with the conviction that we are called very seriously to scrutinise the position offered to us for our adoption, if it is offered that there is under this head a bar to union.

Now, then, I lay it down that if there is a bar to union under this first head, we are bound by this time to see it. (Hear, hear.) I shall presently have to say something about being bound to *say* it. But, for the present, I am speaking of this, that we are fairly bound at this time and this day to see it, if it is there. (Hear, hear.) There is a time during which it is quite fit that men should say, "Well, I reserve that question; I have not made up my mind about it; I think it is a question about which we must compare notes—we must further consider and further advise upon it." But, sir, we are not in that position now. If the question before us were a question of the expediency of going into a union with some differences upon a matter of this kind, and with some differences upon other matters, that might be a good ground for saying the time has not come to settle that question. But it is not the question of expediency which now arises before us. The question of expediency is fully reserved. The question before us is a question of principle, or else it is no question at all. It is a question of principle. Very well, then, I say if there is principle in this case, the theologians and intelligent guides of the Church of Christ are bound to be able by this time to apply their principles to the question, and say, "Ay" or "No," is there a bar to union?

We have been four years at this business. We knew, when we began, it was necessary that there should be inquiry into this matter, as a matter upon which differences were confessed and known to exist. And our United Presbyterian friends met us, and were willing to satisfy us, for they were persuaded it would turn out that a vast deal of what we thought was involved in their position, as opponents of civil establishments, would be found to be an ungrounded impression of ours; at all events, would be found not to represent the actual condition of their Church, nor, as they believe, the position in which it ever had been. We have found that to a very blessed extent. But, sir, our United Presbyterian friends never came into this committee to be converted—(hear, hear)—from any principle which they believed themselves to hold. They came into the committee as we did, I suppose—willing to submit to the discipline of God's providence in enabling us, as our negotiations went on, to extricate the real essence of our principles on either hand from complication and misunderstandings—even from those of which neither side might be distinctly aware at the beginning of the negotiations. (Applause.) That process has been most instructively accomplished in the committee. Now, our United Presbyterian friends tell us—and even if they did not tell us, it requires only common sense to see it—"You have now got the sum and substance; there is no making anything more or other of this question of civil establishments; if there is to be anything further proposed in the way of negotiation on that subject, we must take it as intended to press us up, by some process or other, beyond and away from that which we know to be our honest and substantial opinion under this head." Very well. What they have to say to that is, "We are quite willing, just as you are quite willing, to be learners so long as we live. We are open to learn all our mistakes; but, in the name of our Church, we decline to go to school upon that head in the union committee. We did not think the committee was intended for that purpose; and here you have the sum and substance, the beginning and end of it." The time has come, then, in which we,

as theologians and men of intelligence, should understand our own principles, and are called to take the serious responsibility of making up our minds whether in principle there is a bar to union under this head of the programme. We cannot answer the call plainly addressed to us by our Master, in the providential position in which we are now placed, without now coming forward to make up our minds at His call; because He has placed us in the providential position, with reference to another Church, which requires us to make up our minds, in the use of the best lights we have, whether it is a bar to union, ay or no.

In the second place, if we do see that there is here in point of principle a bar to union—that is to say, that there is something—a principle—which ought to be publicly professed in this Church as a term of ministerial communion, which, under the proposed union, could not be a term of ministerial communion—if we come to that conclusion, we are now bound to be out with it. (Hear, hear.) We are bound to our United Presbyterian brethren, and, more than that, to our own conscience, and the conscience of the community that is looking on, to say frankly, and with perfect courtesy, that we regret that there is a bar which extinguishes at present the hope that we had been cherishing in connexion with this subject. Let us say that with all possible tenderness. If not, let us refuse to take that ground; let us frankly tell our brethren that we go on to these further negotiations because we do not find what in itself is a bar to union—that, as it appears to us in our present position, and with the lights God has given us, there does not appear to be a bar to union. (Applause.)

Now, in approaching what I have to say—and it will not be very much, for it lies, sir, in a narrow compass—on the question, I must remind the House you are bound to approach the consideration of this question with your minds furnished and prepossessed with Presbyterian principles on the matter of the Church. I repeat, you are bound to approach the subject with your minds furnished with Presbyterian principles on the matter of the Church. When a man comes to consider this question—what should be a bar to union—his mind may wander at its own sweet will as to the principles by which he should test what ought to be a bar to union. But this is a matter in which we have no right to assume principles in an arbitrary way. There are some principles which ought to be present to our minds about the unity of the Church of Christ—not only as Christ's Church invisible, but as Christ's catholic visible Church, originally set up—a Church that never falls asunder but by reason of sin and error somewhere—a Church that ought always to regard it as its normal condition, its position of duty and privilege, to be one.

Great misapprehensions have been put abroad in connexion with this subject, by statements made, as if in taking this ground and pressing it, in connexion with some very solemn and interesting texts of the New Testament Scriptures and of our Lord himself—as if, in doing this, we were in effect denying that any unity of the Church was left, when the outward and visible unity is by some interruption rent and broken. (Hear, hear.) It never entered into the minds of any one of those who plead for union to maintain that the visible unity is the only unity, or the fundamental or indestructible unity of the Church of Christ. Of course we know and we all hold that Christ's true Church is one,

as Christ our Lord is one; and that in Him, in whom we all are one, every member of it is embraced, by bonds that cannot be destroyed. We all know what it is to plead that, as we can triumphantly plead it against Popish controversialists and High Churchmen. But then, if we hold—and we are not Presbyterians if we do not hold it—if we hold that Christ gave to His Church institutions, by means of which it was to express—not only express—there is far more in it than mere expressing to the world; but institutions and ordinances in the use of which it should feel its unity, and be exercised in its unity, and in its unity be that thing in the world, moving, living, and working, which its Lord designed;—if that was so, then I say when Christ spoke of the Church being one, He never meant to shut out the idea that it should be one in that sense, and in those institutions by Himself appointed and set up. (Applause.)

In the strange history of the Church—that strange history of which we say, How long shall it be till the end of these things?—the Church has gone through many a crisis and calamity, and shows the permanent results of many a misunderstanding and many a mistake. Many a dividing line separates us now. Yet, sir, we greet one another cordially as brethren, and we meet in committees and on platforms, and in various other ways; some of us have become members of the Evangelical Alliance, and we have various ways of expressing the unity that remains to us across the divided lines of our Churches. Ah, but there was a time, gone by long, long ago, when all those who in any place confessed a common Lord, exercised their unity and felt it around the same communion-table, and in the courts which Christ set up, and not in such committees and alliances as we have been compelled to plan, because we had fallen from the others. (Applause.) There was a time when it entered into no Christian mind that, in any place, those who confessed one common Lord were to sit down contented with a unity that was not expressed, and could not be, in Christ's ordinances and Christ's institutions. There was a time when, if anything fell out to break it, men were grieved and humbled, and apostles wrote moving letters to the Churches concerned; and, after the apostles were gone, the Church of Rome sent her letter to the Church of Corinth, to entreat them to be visibly one in the institutions and ordinances which Christ gave them to express and to exercise their unity. There was such a time, and if since post-apostolic times the Church has gained something, and I think it has gained much, yet surely it has lost something too. There was something they had in the early Church, when they met around the same communion-table and in the same institutions, just as naturally as they went to one martyr-death together—there was something then which we have not now. Therefore we are bound to aim at it—we are bound to seek it as we can, in consistency with principle; and the principles that should be a bar to union, or the diversity of principles that is called a bar to union, should not be such as a man may happen to say he thinks are tangible and of some important application, and are matters with respect to which it is a desirable thing the Churches should agree—nay, nor is it enough, although he should say that he thinks them so important that he does not see how they can be anything but a bar to the union. A man must be prepared to show that the supposed diversity in principle is of such a kind

as to form a sufficient reason for the Church, when it arises, resigning sorrowfully the outward union because it cannot help resigning it, accepting separation, and falling back upon that inward unity which alone is left.

Those who approach questions of this kind with a sort of feeling on their minds that we may get along very well as we are—that we need not be troubled very much about divisions which, after all, leave us on friendly terms—they may be what sort of Presbyterians they will, but they are not the descendants of Gillespie and Rutherford. (Applause.) And I say that all the more freely because, at the outset of this matter, I was not at all disposed to take the least responsibility, and shrank from making any movement towards union. That was my mood of mind at the time, I remember well. I had a strong feeling that questions would arise which it would be difficult to handle, and it is not of my doing that we are now in this position. We have been brought to it by steps we could not help and could not avoid, and it is in these circumstances that we are to discharge our duty to-day. (Applause.)

Well, then, the point before us is this: We find ourselves agreed with our United Presbyterian brethren in regard to the great principles of the Headship of Christ over the nations—that nations and their rulers are bound to obey Christ, to have regard to His expressed will, as clothed with authority, to which authority they are bound to defer in all those matters to which that will applies. And we find ourselves testing our meaning in that matter by various practical applications—as, for instance, by its application to the question whether the civil magistrate ought not to desire and to further the well-being of religion and the Church—whether the civil magistrate ought not to have regard to the word of God in the swearing of oaths and matters of that kind—whether he ought not to have regard to it in the laws he lays down about marriage and the degrees of affinity—whether he ought not to have regard to it in the steps he takes about the Sabbath day—and, in addition to what the committee on union say on that point, we have had recently the discussion on the subject of the Sabbath in the Synod of the United Presbyterian Church itself.

We find ourselves also divided on this point—that we in this Church have always regarded it as a lawful thing, and a thing the Church might properly do, when it should judge it expedient, to receive from the State the advantages of a civil establishment of religion. There are many of us, I know, who are by no means disposed to attach such an importance to that matter as they once were. There are a great many of us whom history has taught some lessons on the question of expediency that we are not likely to forget as long as we live in this world. (Hear, hear.) But that is our position; it is the position in which we are practically agreed, it is the principle by which we have been accustomed to regulate our practice. Well, on the other hand, our friends lay down this principle as their distinctive article: “That it is not competent to the civil magistrate to give legislative sanction to any creed, in the way of setting up a civil establishment of religion; nor is it within his province to provide for the expense of the ministrations of religion out of the national resources. That Jesus Christ, as sole King and Head of His Church, has enjoined upon His people to provide for

maintaining and extending it by free-will offerings; that this being the ordinance of Christ, it excludes State aid for these purposes; and that adherence to it is the true safeguard of the Church's independence. Moreover, though uniformity of opinion with respect to civil establishments of religion is not a term of communion in the United Presbyterian Church, yet the views on this subject held, and universally acted on, are opposed to these institutions." So I suppose we may state it in this way, that our United Presbyterian friends are practically agreed in taking it that the civil magistrate is not warranted in following out the general principle of his subjection to Christ to the effect of setting up a civil establishment of religion, even though that should be done on the professed ground of being designed to further the kingdom of Christ. And they think so because they believe it sufficiently indicated that Christ's will is not that the civil magistrate should do that thing; and they also hold that it can be shown that he could not do it without trenching on some other principles which he is bound to have regard to. And they say they cannot be members or ministers of any Church in which the contrary opinion is made a term of communion. This, I think, is in substance the difference between us.

Now, sir, there are two things which those who take the view opposed to that I take, are called upon to do. In the first place, I think they are bound—the presumption being in favour of union unless we can show a bar—to make it out that the lawfulness of civil establishments must always be held as a term of Christian and ministerial communion, and that it must be held and taught apart from any clear providential call to deal with the question for any practical ends. I repeat it. They are bound to show that the principle must be held and taught in all Churches as a term of Christian and ministerial communion, and that it must be held and taught apart from any clear providential call to deal with the question for any practical ends.

I am not to assume what will be said on that point, but that is my view of the state of the question, and of the practical responsibility which lies upon those who take the other side of the question I am now dealing with. The position I take in the meantime, and which I do not feel it necessary to dwell upon at present, is this—that while I hold the lawfulness of civil establishments in religion, when the Church can be satisfied that they can be set up, to speak it shortly, without doing more harm than good—I hold the whole question is a practical question as to the application of principles, one which arises, properly speaking, subsequent to the Church and Church's Confession. (Applause.) I hold that the Church's proper Confession is the general duty of the civil magistrate as Christ's subject, and that the question how far he is to give effect to it, and especially whether he is to give effect to it in ways that seriously involves the Church's well-being, is properly a question that arises subsequently, and just when God calls in His providence to deal with it. (Applause.) There is not to me any difficulty as to the question whether the principle that he ought to subject himself to Christ does not fairly cover certain applications of it. I have no doubt about it, but I say it is a question that arises subsequently to the complete Church and the complete Confession, and that arises then and there when God's providence calls upon the Church to settle it for a practical purpose. Now, the other side are bound to reargue that. The fair

position that belongs to the other side is to show a bar in point of principle, and to show the general duty of the Church on the grounds of Scripture and principle.

Another thing they will have to do is this—I think they are fairly bound to show that the Confession of Faith binds us all, and binds us plainly, to hold this practical application as part of our Confession of Faith as a Church. They will not find it so easy to do that. (Applause.) They will find it easy to bring an argument satisfactory to me to show that, admitting the principle of the duty of the magistrate laid down in the Confession of Faith, it is a fair practical result of that to say that an Establishment may be set up. I have no objection to that argument, but I say they will not find it very easy to show that the Confession of Faith binds this Church, as a term of ministerial communion, to the practical application that arises subsequently when God's providence calls the Church practically to settle it. My opinion is, that the Westminster Divines had no doubt at all that it was a fair and legitimate application of the principle; and I believe, also, that they were too wise to put in a fair and legitimate application of the principle, when their business was to settle only what was essential to the principal itself.

Now, Moderator, holding that view, I maintain that there is no reason against our taking up the position alongside of our United Presbyterian brethren, of the Church and its Confession antecedent to that subsequent practical question. I believe that is the line of duty and the position we ought to take up; and I believe that, in taking up that position, we put ourselves in the right relation to the practical question, and put ourselves in the right relation to one very important element of the practical question whenever it shall arise—namely, Whether, on any view of it, it is practically expedient, or for the Church's good, to enter into such a connexion with the State, if the Church itself does not happen to be clear about that practical application, or is, in fact, divided with respect to it.

It is quite possible—though the proper argument is that about principle—that a difficulty may be brought forward which, though not strictly a difficulty in principle, has such a connexion with principle as to operate in men's minds on that side. It may be said that you will find that the practical diversity cannot subsist without mischief—it will interfere with your duty; and here comes in the matter of open questions. I wish to place before the General Assembly what I understand to be our position about that. It is the position brought out by the answers to the queries proposed by our committee to those of the other two Churches. Now, with reference to that, you will observe that our United Presbyterian friends have told us in what sense they understand open questions on these important points; and you will also observe that our United Presbyterian friends are willing to make certain matters open questions, and to accept the decision of the united Church about them. They are willing to take it that, on those matters, whatever decision, within certain limits, the united Church may give, shall not be held inconsistent with the understanding on which we are united. They are willing to do that; but they have not pledged themselves—and I never thought myself of asking them to do it, and would be much surprised if any one did it—they never pledged themselves not to follow

their own view of duty as to when or where they would raise a question about these matters.

Use may be made of this to convey the impression that what is before us, in the prospect of union, is an eternal wrangle about the question of the civil magistrate in its application to some comparatively subordinate details, if not in application to the great question of the endowment of the Church. I shall state my impression of the position of our United Presbyterian brethren on that matter. I say it is impossible that our United Presbyterian brethren could come into any union, tying themselves hand and foot about what they were to do, in God's providence, as questions arose, in the way of peacefully and suitably dealing with Christian brethren about what they thought the Church should do in the circumstances. While they are in this attitude, they are also prepared to say, "However the Church decides these questions, we do not regard that as breaking up the union or interfering with the understanding on which the union is formed." But there is something our United Presbyterian friends could not say. There is something they had an excellent right to expect us to say for them. Our United Presbyterian brethren could not add, as an appendix to that statement:—"But we think you may take us as Christian gentlemen and Christian ministers with a fair share of good feeling and practical wisdom." I think we may say that for them. (Cheers.) I think we may take it that they would not come into that union if they anticipated that the line of their duty would involve for them and us such an eternal wrangle. We have made it clear to them what we regard as the meaning of an open question—that the Churches must decide according to the wisdom and light given them, without being held to have departed from the basis of union. They say, "We understand it so; we are willing to go into such a Church, and to experience the common influence of mind upon mind in that Church, each upon the other." And I think we may add for them, with common sense and right feeling at least equal to our own. And as we go forward, if this union shall be accomplished, we do not go forward pledged to forego for ever anything any one holds to be duty in the practical application of it. We go forward with that open in this sense, that while we hold our own principles, and make practical application of them according to the terms of ministerial communion arranged, we remain, on both sides, willing to learn—we from them, if we find they have something to teach us, and they willing to learn from us, if, on further acquaintance with us, they find we have something to teach them.

I now refer to the limitation introduced into this motion, with what seems to myself an almost needless iteration. (Dr Rainy then quoted the language referred to—"As at present advised"—"reserving final judgment on the whole case, and every part thereof," &c.) I think a great deal less than all that might have satisfied anybody as to the position we take up when we proceed to say that we find no bar to union. The whole question is reserved for final determination, whether even the practical differences on this head, along with other things, might, upon considerations of expediency, make it practically wise to defer, at least, the hope of being united. All questions of that kind are reserved, including the questions of differences in our management and financial system.

From the very first, the question that bulked largest in my mind was not the first head of the programme, nor the second, nor almost any of the others, but the Sustentation Fund. It seemed to me a very serious question, whether two Churches that differed so widely in the process by which they have formed their financial methods, could, without a good deal of difficulty, bring their methods into one; and I have a very strong feeling indeed that it will deserve the very best consideration of the Committee and the Church how this matter can be brought into such a state as to justify us in saying that, in going into the union, we are not resigning and casting away means of influence so distinctly put into our hands by God, that we cannot see it to be our duty to resign it. All that is reserved.

People tell me there are so many people, and people so influential, that have a strong objection, and are very unwilling, and do not see their way even to go along with us, if we go into this union. And I believe precisely the same thing is true on the United Presbyterian side. I believe that in both Churches there are persons, highly estimable and conscientious, who have a difficulty in getting over the practical impressions associated with their historical position and past proceedings. It is a very serious question what is to be done if there should prove to be in the end many in this position. That question also surely is reserved; but I think the right way of influencing the minds of such persons is for us to make clear our own position in this Church and Assembly, according to our own lights, what is the position we are prepared to take up. Perhaps that may be the most likely means by which these Christian persons may ripen their own independent Christian convictions in such a way as shall remove the difficulties that may exist on that score in the one Church or the other.

Finally, there is an argument that I have felt the strength of. "If you go into this union," it is said, "although you carry with you the whole of that which you are entitled to claim to carry, you will still in some sense break with the past. The past history of your Church has been associated with a position practically—whatever you may say about the distinction between a principle and the application of it—practically involving an impression common to us all about what is right and fit for the civil magistrate to do. But when united, the Church will be no longer a Church furnished and possessed with that common impression regarding all those elements of our past history. There will be a certain division on that point." This is an argument derived from the sentiment of the past. Well, I suppose that Churches as well as individuals are sometimes called, in the providence of God, to resign certain aspects of their position in point of sentiment and practice, which they would not on their own motion cast away, but which, in the providence of God, and according to the will of the Head of the Church—the Church, like the individual, feels itself called on to resign to a higher and clearer duty; and that is the question, as to a shade of sentiment on this point—a worthy, dignified, useful sentiment, but a sentiment which may be exaggerated. I do not believe that, if we clear our feet on the leading point of duty, we shall find it turn out that Christ is leading us away from anything in the past that was His gift to us; it will return, it will produce itself in the future. But on this question—this historical question—it will as little do for Churches as for men to guide themselves by

sentiments. We must not, dare not, do it. By all means let us feel what is graceful, noble, dignified ; but, in so far as sentiment separates itself from duty, it is from duty that we take the principles we ought to follow.

For my own part, I certainly ought not, as a professor of Church History, to be insensible to the attraction of the past, and of all that identifies us with it. And we shall still truly be identified with all our noble past ; but it is natural, I admit, to wish an identification the fullest, and completest, and roundest, and most manifest that may be, with the worthies of the past to whom we cling. Nor, I suppose, are our United Presbyterian friends insensible to the sacrifices they make of the sentiments dear to them, that identify them precisely with the early history of the Secession. But while I think my own natural tendencies are so conservative that I would always gladly cling to the past if I could, I confess I am pressed upon by the present ; and still more, I think I hear the future crying to us with a voice we cannot mistake. It is the future that is the great question, the future that lies between us and the coming of Christ. The past !—it is gone, gone with its high memories and grand associations, and worthy deeds, and worthies at whose feet we sat to learn. But the future is before us, and it is gathering for our children. What are we to do for the future ? What position are we to take for the future ? And if any one says, Do you suppose you can gauge the future—create the future ?—I answer, No ; I am not so vain as to think that ; but, come what will in the future, what calamities, what trials, what hard and doubtful times may come, with divisions about doctrine wringing men's hearts and rending the peace of families—with practical questions the most difficult to settle—only let us take care that we take up the position our Lord is calling us to take up, in awaiting that future. I know that it is not the decisive argument, but I confess that it would wring my heart to think that after all that has come and gone between this Church and the United Presbyterian Church—I have spoken of them alone, not from any disrespect to our beloved brethren of the Reformed Presbyterian Church, for there the difficulty is so small that nobody thinks it to require discussion ; and because they give such an emphatic testimony to this, that the Articles of Agreement save the whole of that Church's testimony ; but I say it would wring my heart if, after all that has come and gone, our United Presbyterian brethren, and we, and the descendants of both Churches—not the ministers and members living now, whatever their prejudices, or prepossessions, or sentiments, but the ministers that might be trained in the same halls, and the people that might grow up in the same congregations, exchanging all the Christian influences that almost all Scotland possesses—if we are to fall back from our approximation and go forth to work apart, and fulfil what seems to be the inevitable destiny of Churches so situated, to make and find out differences—because differences do not exist—to find them out, to manufacture them, and to fight for them. Is it in this position we must await the future that lies between us and the coming of the Lord Jesus Christ ? (Great and prolonged applause.)

Mr DUNLOP, M.P.—I rise for the purpose of seconding the motion, which I have intense gratification in doing. I, too, deeply regret that it was not made by Dr Candlish, with whom I used to be associated in contests before the Disruption. It must, however, be a great consolation

to Dr Candlish, as it is to us all, to know that the thinned and thinning ranks of those who had to take part in the struggles of that period have been strengthened by such men as Dr Rainy, who has shown by his appearance this day that he can wield the weapons of debate as skilfully and with as much power as the ablest amongst us. (Cheers.) When Dr Candlish and I were engaged in the long fight before the Disruption, that great triumph, as I would call it, which it issued, was attended with many sorrows and many disruptions ; but now we are seeking to accomplish an event which will unite us with other branches of the Presbyterian Church, and which, if successful, will bring about another mighty triumph that will be embittered by no regrets at all, and be brightened by a glorious prospect for the future. (Applause.) I do not much regard the matter of sentiment referred to by Dr Rainy. I agree with him that sentiment must give way to duty ; but with me the sentimental feeling is all the other way, viz., that when we shall be united with the two other branches of the Presbyterian body, we shall really unite ourselves with the whole of the glorious associations of the Church of Scotland of all times, and with all those who ever formed the best part of that Church. The only portion that will be left out will be one which, I think, was alien to the proper Church of Scotland—alien, I mean, as the remnant of Episcopacy and the curates of that Church, at the time of the persecutions, who, after the Revolution, were admitted, reintroduced patronage and became Moderates—(laughter and applause)—and remain now as the Established Church of Scotland. I think that any feeling of national sentiment that we may have should rather lead us to look to one glorious ancestry in a union combining everything good and glorious in the Presbyterian Church. (Applause.) I never really had much difficulty in feeling that there was no bar to union. As soon as I was satisfied that our United Presbyterian friends held, as I some years ago learned, and believe now that they do, the doctrine of the Headship of Christ over the nations, and that they acknowledged the duty of kings and rulers to Christ as their head, and that it was their duty to exercise their functions as rulers according to the laws of God, and also to advance the kingdom of God, as they had opportunity within their own proper province—as soon as I learned this, I felt that there was no difficulty at all in the way. Every obstacle has been removed, so far as doctrine is concerned. (Applause.) As to the mere matter of the duty of setting up an Establishment, it always seemed to me to be a question solely of expediency. If you will admit the duty of the nations to advance in the truth, the matter of setting up an Establishment will depend entirely on the circumstances of the peculiar case ; and I remember well, when I was a member of the Established Church, and while very red-hot in maintaining the principles of an Establishment, I used confidently to maintain the paradox that the Church of Ireland ought, on Established principles, to be put down—that it was the duty of the State, on the principle that we called the Establishment principle, to put down that Church, because in that way we would more advance the progress of the Christian religion than we could do by keeping it up. (Applause.) I am still longing for that event, and I am sure that the friend whom I see before me, the representative of the Irish Presbyterian Church, will not, in looking forward to the distribution of the revenues of the Church of Ireland, seek to share in the spoil. I, there-

fore, felt no difficulty at all on that subject; but still I think it was quite right to satisfy men's minds that we should have a long and searching inquiry as to what the opinions and principles of our brethren really were, and to probe it to the bottom; and now, having done so, I am just as ready as any one can be to go forward with this union—(applause)—in the full conviction that we are doing not only what is consistent with duty, but are fulfilling duty in getting rid of those mere cavils, as I take them to be, in order to carry out the union which Christ intended should be effected between His people who held by the same common standards. (Applause.) I think we are now called upon to do that. I cannot imagine how our friends should wish that the matter should still be postponed. All the subjects of importance, in point of principle, have been gone over. There may arise subjects of some little difficulty in regard to minor matters, such as the Sustentation Fund, which will make the union practically more difficult. That, however, is no reason why we should not look at and seek to overcome them, so as to remove all obstacles. But if there had been any question of principle against the union, it is quite clear that we ought to have refused to have entered into the negotiation; but having done so, why should we hesitate as to the course we should adopt? If any of our friends do not see their way to this, and are, on principle, opposed to the union, they ought at once to come forward and say so. But the very fact of agreeing to reappoint the committee implies a declaration on our part that we see no obstacles in the way of union. I could not acquiesce in the reappointing of the committee if I did feel that there was any principle acting as a barrier to it. In that case I would hold that it is the duty of the Assembly not to reappoint the committee, but that the manly and honest course is to do so with a declaration that, so far as we see, there is no obstacle to its accomplishment. (Applause.)

Dr BEGG said—I require, on many grounds, the indulgence of this House, and in particular, because I am unwell, and, but for the great importance of this matter, should not have been here to-day. I never rose in an Assembly with a deeper conviction of the great importance of the issues to which we are brought by the motions now under debate; and I verily believe the future of the Church will be determined by the result of the vote to which we must come. Perhaps it may be right, before I utter another word, that I should clear away a little mist that has been attempted to be thrown about myself in connexion with this movement. I have always been a friend of union, and, in fact, was a friend of union in connexion with the movement of Sir George Sinclair, before some of those who are now so zealous had taken up the question at all—nay, at the time that they were opposed to this union. But, at the same time, I have always said, and took particular care to say in the first Assembly in which this question was broached, and at every occasion in which the debate had been renewed, that, anxious as I was for union, I have always been still more anxious for the maintenance of the truth. I believe that no aggregation of numbers will be of the slightest advantage if we do not maintain in substance at least—I do not say always in particular outward form—but in substance what we hold to be in accordance with the Word of God. An allegation has been made that I left the union committee, and I wish the House to understand the circumstances in which that event took place, and the true meaning

and import of that event. At the end of the union report you will find in the minutes of the Free Church committee, at the bottom of the first page of these minutes, that a discussion took place immediately after the meeting of the last General Assembly. My clear understanding was, that the Assembly had sent down that report to the Presbyteries, and had fixed a time by which these Presbyteries should make their returns, and that we as a committee ought not to meddle with these articles of agreement, as they have been called, until we received the suggestions from our several Presbyteries. That was my undoubted opinion, and is my opinion still, and accordingly it was moved—"That the committee are of opinion that the joint-committee should take no further action in the way of any alteration of the document sent down to Presbyteries till the returns from Presbyteries be received." It was also moved and seconded, that the committee are not of this opinion. And the votes having been taken, it appeared that the second motion was carried by a considerable majority. From this deliverance Dr Gibson dissented, and protested for leave to complain to the General Assembly, if he should see cause. To this dissent Mr Main and I adhered. Every one must see that in the circumstances we could take no part in meddling with these articles of agreement until the returns of the various Presbyteries were received, and therefore we instantly intimated that we would not continue on the committee until that took place; but that as soon as the returns were obtained, and as soon as the committee had resumed its labours, we would attend again.

[At this stage of Dr Begg's speech Dr Candlish entered the House, and was received with loud and repeated cheers.]

Dr BEGG continued—We are exceedingly glad to see Dr Candlish in this place again. I say that we resigned our place in the committee, and I just put it to this House to say whether the course which we thus pursued was not the only course which we could have pursued in the circumstances, and whether any fair inference could be drawn from that course of general hostility to the operations of the committee. No doubt we thought the alterations which were proposed to be of a most decidedly serious and dangerous kind. I am still of that opinion, although the matter after a struggle was subsequently improved. It might at this stage be right to say a word or two on the general question of prosecuting union with the other Churches. There are three classes of persons in the community, I have no doubt, holding respectively different opinions on that subject. There may be some who are decidedly opposed to union altogether, and have declined even to entertain the question. I believe they are a comparatively small number. There may be those, on the other hand, who are so decidedly set upon union that they are prepared to pay any price for it, and to subordinate truth and consistency to obtain that object. (Loud cries of "No, no," and some hisses.) I say it is quite conceivable that there may be some of that class, but I believe it is a small class. My impression is, that the large body of our ministers and people are in favour of union, and are only desirous to see how that union could be accomplished in consistency with the principles upon which we have hitherto maintained it as a Church. (Hear, hear, and applause.) That is my own position, and I think it is a right and reasonable one, and I am prepared to maintain it in the face of the world, and though I stood alone on these grounds which I am prepared to

occupy. (Cheers.) We have had reference to Rutherford and Gillespie by my excellent friend Dr Rainy, but no quotation from them. It may be right that you should hear one or two worthy of being listened to, on the subject of union before proceeding further. Dr M'Crie says—"Peace is always desirable in itself, and the peace of the Church ought to be earnestly pursued. But the cry of peace is often employed by those who are engaged in courses of defection in order to drown all opposition to their measures, and not unfrequently those are loudest in proclaiming the evils of division and schism, who are themselves chargeable with them, and who are pushing new schemes destructive of peace and unity as already settled in societies, or which sow the seeds of future dissensions and endless separation. These, instead of laying a solid foundation for peace will foment discord and breed confusions, as the Romans built a temple to Concord in the spot where the seditions of the Gracchi had been committed, which in future times, instead of restraining was the means of exciting to tumults and bloodshed. Let none be moved by confident assertions that the matters now in dispute are of small moment. Although they were allowed to be so, this would be no reason for tamely relinquishing them; and Christ puts His servants to a more eminent test of fidelity in requiring them to adhere to these when they are opposed. The fact is, that every truth, during the time that it was controverted, has been uniformly represented by its opponents as inconsiderable and minute, and very frequently, through the artful management of the erroneous, and by the permission of God for the trial of His Church, the controversy has been made to turn upon a point apparently narrow. 'There was never a trial yet in the Church,' says Mr Livingstone, 'but in the time of it, it was brought to a seemingly small thing. Satan can put the trial on such a frame, he can draw it to such a point, and set it, as they say, like a razor's edge. Yet still, though there seems but little between the two, the one side is a denying of Christ, and the other a confessing Him.'" There is a very remarkable passage in the sermons of Alexander Henderson, just published by Mr Martin. Being, of course, the great leader of the second Reformation, he is as worthy of being listened to as Rutherford and Gillespie on such a subject as this, and his principle is thus stated:—"Neither let us for any care or fear of this kind depart from the smallest thing that is in our Covenant, for if ye lose but one dram-weight of God's glory and honour ye shall not miss to lose a whole stone-weight of your own with it. . . . And so men by their policies and devices that they use contrary to the commandment they are aye twining and twisting so many ropes to hang themselves." I shall not quote a very remarkable passage from Ralph Erskine, but it is to be found in M'Crie's statement. I shall go on right to the motion and expound it, after which I shall look at the other motion, and give my reasons why I cannot support it. The motion I have to propose is,—“The Assembly, in receiving the report laid on the table by the committee on union with other Churches, approve of the diligence of the committee, and re-appoint it with its former instructions. The Assembly at the same time, considering the immature state of the question, the overtures now on the table, and the fact that whilst only one third of the ministers of this Church are entitled to be present in the Assembly, the people of the Church at large have never been consulted in regard to this matter at all—reserve

their judgment on any part of the programme till the union committee shall have completed its work by bringing up a report on all the heads of the programme, with definite proposals, and the grounds on which they rest, so that the General Assembly and the Church may have the whole subject before them." Now, I agree with Dr Rainy that the great question before us is, in the first place, the question under the first head of the programme, namely, the relation of the civil magistrate to religion and to the Church. I have not one word to say in opposition to the articles of agreement. In fact, I believe—though, perhaps, I should not say it—I have had something to do in resisting attempts to lower these articles of agreement below the standard to which they have attained. I rejoice in them, and cordially approve of them; but, at the same time, I am not so sure as some of our friends that they have as yet received a formal sanction from the United Presbyterian Church. Of course, that is a matter of opinion, but I do not see, on reading the decision—though it seems to intimate as much—that it necessarily implies as much. I know there are ministers—I know at least one minister—a man of decided intelligence, who voted in the majority on that occasion, and who does not think he is committed to the approbation of these articles of agreement: while if you read the suggestions that are made by the Presbyteries of the United Presbyterian Church, you will see that their impression—at least previous to the meeting of Synod—was, that there ought to be more of an open question in regard to this whole matter than what is implied in sustaining the articles of agreement, and making all beyond that open. I do not intend to dwell upon that, however, because I am prepared to close with our friends upon the question whether we shall now, in this Assembly, make what still remains an open question, and shall come to the conclusion that no further conference ought to be desired by us from our United Presbyterian and other friends upon that head of the programme. I say other friends, because the peculiar views of the Reformed Presbyterians have, in my mind, a very serious bearing upon the position of the civil magistrate if they are to be introduced into a Church as large as ours. The question is—What has our Church hitherto maintained, and what is she at the present moment, by her standards, bound to maintain upon the subject of the duty of the civil magistrate to the Church of Christ? I throw out of view altogether the idea of the mere fact of endowments, and, for one, I am quite prepared, if I thought any good would spring from it, and that it would not simply result in stripping Churches that are sound, and leaving unsound Churches to reap the whole spoil—(hear, hear, and applause)—for that is the shape the matter has now taken, I am quite prepared to consider the question of the universal disestablishment of the Churches over the entire United Kingdom. (Cheers.) But even suppose all this is done, the question still remains—What is the duty of the civil magistrate, as laid down in the Word of God, in regard to the maintenance and support of the Church of Christ, and what is it the duty of our Church, in particular, to maintain upon the subject? It is unnecessary to enter upon any lengthened proof in regard to our past history. No one will deny that during the days of Knox, when the Church was first of all recognised, secondly endowed, it has always been maintained, not only in practice but in theory, to be the duty of the civil magistrate

to endow the Church of Christ. But what was the ten years' conflict about? Was it a mere conflict for the simple independence of the Church? There never needed to have been any conflict upon the subject. We might have left the Established Church. I might have left it, for example, when I was a minister at Paisley, more than thirty years ago, and when I fought this question on the grounds of Scripture and the duty of the magistrate as laid down there. I shall not admit now that I fought the battle merely because I had pecuniarily an interest in it. That would be a slander on myself. (Loud cheers.) I fought it on the broader ground that the magistrate is bound to support the Church of Christ, and yet is not entitled to enslave the Church of Christ—in other words, that the Church of Christ is entitled both to be established and to be free; and I say that if we are to admit that the ten years' conflict was not fought on that ground, we would stamp ourselves as schismatics and raisers of trouble in the community—(loud cheers)—for a period of twenty years—that is what we would do if we admit for a moment that there was nothing else in the ten years' conflict. And, accordingly, we know that when the Disruption actually took place, Dr Chalmers took some pains, from the chair of the new General Assembly, to declare that we hold both these views. Perhaps it may be necessary to refresh the memory of some of our friends on this subject. Dr Chalmers, in that remarkable address, said—"It is not for those ministers of Christ whom I am now addressing, and who, on the altar of principle have just laid down their all—thus quitting, for the sake of one principle, the friendship of men who have the power of office, it is not for them to give up another principle for the sake of the friendship of other men, who may be also said to have power—the power of numbers. We must not thus transfer ourselves from one earthly dependence to another. We have no other dependence than God. We acknowledge the authority, and will submit to the influence of no other guide than the eternal and unalterable truth as seen in the light of our own consciences. To be more plain, let me be more particular. The Voluntaries mistake us, if they conceive us to be Voluntaries. We hold by the duty of Government to give up their resources and their means for the maintenance of a gospel ministry in the land; and we pray that their eyes may be opened, so that they may learn how to acquit themselves as the protectors of the Church, and not as its corrupters or its tyrants." I am exceedingly glad that Dr Candlish has come in, for this, among other reasons, that I wish to adduce him as a witness of what was universally understood to be maintained by Dr Chalmers at that stage. Dr Candlish said—"I cordially go along with the sentiments expressed by our rev. Moderator respecting the danger of letting down our high testimony, in order to conciliate the powers of this world on the one hand, or to conciliate numbers on the other. I trust we shall be enabled, both in our Assemblies, and, if possible, in our outward and tangible acts, to maintain uncompromised our principle of a religious Establishment. I trust we shall resist every notion or proposal of an incorporating union with any Church that differs from us on that point." Now Dr Chalmers's name has been used, and, as I think, abused, in connexion with this matter. I hold in my hand the last volume of his memoirs, and find that, in the very year in which he died—in that year 1847, which spread such a gloom over Scotland by his death—he

reiterated his earnest desire that this Church would never give up that principle. He says:—

“ We rejoice, therefore, in the testimony of the Free Church for the principle of a national Establishment, and most sincerely do we hope that she will never fall away from it. Little do those of her enemies who, at the same time, are friends of loyalty and order, (for, besides these, we can rank many of the turbulent and disaffected in society as among the deadliest of her enemies,) little do they know that the Free Church is at this moment lifting a far more influential testimony on the side of ecclesiastical endowments than can possibly be given in any other quarter of society. Hers is a wholly disinterested testimony in their favour; for she reaps no advantage from them. But sorely grieved though she has been by our rulers, she will neither underrate the importance of their friendship, nor yet the solemn obligation which lies upon them to care for the religion of the people, and to provide within their sphere for this best and highest interest of the commonwealth.” That is the last utterance of Dr Chalmers on the subject; and I am confident, notwithstanding what has been said, that there is a misunderstanding about the opinion of Dr Cunningham also on this subject; but at all events, here is Dr Chalmers almost with his dying breath expressing a wish that the Free Church would never abandon her testimony on behalf of ecclesiastical establishments. Now, there is one point in that statement which I wish those who listened to the eloquent pleading both of Dr Buchanan and Dr Rainy would reflect upon—viz., that our adherence to this as part of God’s truth, is all the more impressive and all the more important, just because we have nothing to gain, and in the meantime nothing to expect from it. It has been reiterated again and again, that because we are not likely to get anything by the principle of ecclesiastical establishments, that that is a reason why we should abandon that principle; but Dr Chalmers’s statement evidently implies the opposite; and it is a remarkable fact that our Church herself has expressed, has voted, and has affirmed the opposite in a series of resolutions which were adopted by the Assembly in 1853, and which were moved by Dr Candlish. The first of these resolutions is as follows:—“ That this Church maintains, unaltered and uncompromised, the principles set forth in the Claim of Right of 1842, and the Protest of 1843, relative to the lawfulness and obligation of a scriptural alliance between the Church of Christ and the State, and the conditions upon which such an alliance ought to be regulated.” And then it goes on to say, that as there is no immediate prospect of there being any practical result flowing from these principles, “ it is the duty of the Church, all the more on this account, to adopt measures for keeping before the minds of the people, and especially of the rising generation, the principles which this Church holds, and the position which she occupies as the Free Protestant Church of Scotland.” Now, setting aside the articles of agreement, we are confronted with two conflicting propositions;—our own proposition, which embodies our existing principles, viz.—that as an additional homage to Christ, the civil magistrate ought, when necessary and expedient, to afford aid from the national resources to the cause of Christ. That we unanimously voted as a principle of our Church—in other words, as a Bible truth. I wish the Assembly to mark that, for I have a few remarks to make upon it. On the other

hand, our United Presbyterian brethren make a statement, not in regard to any of their ecclesiastical documents or binding deeds, but simply as a general fact in regard to their community, but also in regard to what is alleged to be a Bible truth—viz., that the Lord Jesus Christ, as the sole King and Head of the Church, has enjoined upon His people to provide for maintaining and extending His cause by freewill offerings; and this being the ordinance of Christ, it excludes State aid for this purpose. Well, that is, of course, a directly contradictory statement—(applause)—and both statements cannot be true according to the Word of God; and it is extremely difficult to understand where the United Church would be, if uniting upon a basis which contains elements so flatly contradictory—the one class of which it would be composed believing that to be a duty which the other class believes to be a sin. (Renewed applause.) And I wish our friends to consider whether it is possible to leave matters in that unsatisfactory state; or whether we are not bound to see whether we cannot come nearer the truth than that; and all the more because while we are bound, as I think, and as I shall immediately show, they are not bound. They are open to consider that proposition again in the light of the Word of God, and by means of a brotherly conference; but we, with our present light, cannot, I think, give it up without abandoning our testimony as a Church of Christ, and the terms of our Confession of Faith. (Applause.) Dr Rainy's challenge was a perfectly fair one. I know that two things are said on this subject—one is, that our formula of adherence was altered in 1846—that though we were bound before that—I presume that is the statement—(a cry of "No, no")—very well, it is alleged that that formula does not bind us to maintain the principle of an ecclesiastical establishment. I am prepared for setting aside altogether the whole string of our decisions as a Church, to bring this matter to the test of the Confession itself; for we all hold the whole doctrine of the Confession of Faith, except that we have a qualifying clause, but which does not apply to this. The question is this—Does the Confession of Faith, as held by us, and as our committee ought to know, maintain that it is a homage due to Christ, on the part of the nations, to give of their substance for the advancement of His cause? I say that it does, and that it clearly does; for I maintain that no man who has read the history of the period will doubt that the proofs from Scripture embodied in the Confession are as much part of the doctrine, and in reality the doctrine of the Church, as the statements which they are called to illustrate and to prove; because the Westminster Assembly of Divines, when they laid their statement before the Parliament, were asked to bring in marginal notes to prove every part of it by Scripture. Well, the 23d chapter of the Confession, section 3, contains this clause. After speaking of the general duty of the magistrate, it says:—"The civil magistrate may not assume to himself the administration of the Word and Sacraments, or the power of the keys of the kingdom of Heaven, yet he hath authority, and it is his duty to take order, &c., that all the ordinances of God be duly settled, administered, and observed." First of all they must be duly settled. What are the Scripture proofs which the Westminster Divines give to establish that proposition? In the first place, "Kings shall be thy nursing fathers, and their queens thy nursing mothers;" and "Blessed be the Lord God of our Fathers, who hath put such a thing in the king's

heart, to beautify the house of the Lord which is in Jerusalem." (Applause.) Is that a mere abstraction—the theory, as it has been called, of an Establishment; or was it not the actual giving of material support for the establishment and maintenance of the Church? Well, I do not know what other men feel in connexion with the obligation of that Confession; but I for one feel, and have always felt, that, as a minister of this Church, this is the doctrine which I preach, and glory in preaching—(cheers)—and so far as I can see I will preach it to my life's end—(loud cheers)—viz., that Christ, being King of nations as well as King of saints, they are bound to know Him, not only in the making of laws, but to bring to Him of their resources for the advancement of His cause; and those nations that will not serve Christ thus shall perish—yea, they shall be utterly wasted. (Applause.) I do not establish, as Dr Rainy has hinted, my duty in the light of providence. I establish my duty not in the light of providence, but by the light of the Word of God altogether; and far less do I do so when that providence is in regard to the future, of which I know nothing—(applause)—except that the time is coming when the kings of Tarshish and the isles shall bring presents, and when the queens of Sheba and Seba shall offer gifts; and it will be strange if, before that time comes, the Church shall have discovered, and shall have avowed that it was out of the question for them to bring these presents, there being an ordinance of Christ which prohibited her from accepting them. (Loud cheers.) I have been told that a minister of our Church last Sabbath-day preached upon the text, "She remembered not her last end, and therefore she came down wonderfully." (Laughter.) His interpretation was, that the Church instead of looking at the present, or even looking at the past, should also look at the future, not in the light of human sagacity, but in the light of the sure word of prophecy to which we would do well to take heed, "as unto a light shining in a dark place." We may say, as was said, of one of the tribes, "A troop shall overcome him, but he shall overcome at the last." But she remembered not her last end; she looked not forward to the time when her triumphant Lord would come, and when all nations should serve and obey Him. She gave up the truth in deference to some fancied advantage, and therefore "she came down wonderfully." (Cheers.) Observe what is the real meaning of what is proposed in the matter of these open questions. I am confident that this Assembly can never come to an intelligent opinion upon this question without settling that in their minds. What does an open question mean in reference to this particular matter? My interpretation of it is this:—It means that while as individuals we may continue to hold that opinion, as a Church we are to give up that testimony on behalf of the right of Christ to be served by nations with their goods and substance. We are not merely to say that, in particular circumstances, we separate from the State, and wash our hands from their crimes, but we do say that it is unlawful—that we give up the doctrine that it is lawful—for nations thus to act. I say—What right have we to give it up? What right, as I have demanded again and again in the committee, have our friends to give up what they believe to be a position in accordance with the Word of God? Those who say and believe that it is a Christian ordinance that nations should give nothing to the cause of Christ—how can they also make that an open question? We are no more entitled to do

so in these circumstances than to abandon the Ten Commandments—(cries of “Oh, oh,”)—and to make them an open question. We are as little entitled to make this matter an open question—in other words, to abandon the claims we have hitherto put forth on behalf of our Lord and Master Jesus Christ, in the face of the nations, as we are to abandon our position as witnesses for Christ at all. Where is this to cease? It is required of a steward that a man be found faithful, and he who is unfaithful in that which is least is unfaithful also in much; and whilst other men will no doubt be comparatively innocent who have never professed such views as we maintain, and who do not even understand them, I say, what will be our position if, knowing these things and maintaining them for three hundred years, we give them up—and give them up not because we have changed our minds—not because we don’t believe them to be a Bible truth, but because we think we will gain some immediate advantage, in the union of the Churches, by abandoning these principles? I say that is an infidel theory, when examined to the bottom—(expressions of dissent and applause)—for if you begin to make light of God’s truth, and give way, where are you to halt? I know that some are ready to say—“But how can the negotiations go on, if you insist that this matter be still kept open?” Well, I say that if the negotiations cannot go on without such an unreasonable demand as that we should abandon our principles without one moment of conference, I am not to be held responsible—for I deny that here there has been, as stated, a four years’ conference on the subject. There is a misunderstanding here. We explicated these points of difference, but we did not for five minutes talk about them, and I hold that, as Christian men, we are entitled to say that, taking a common Bible—if we are not to take a common Confession—we cannot both in this matter be right; for there cannot both be in the Bible an ordinance of Christ prohibiting kings and nations from serving Him with their substance, and an express prediction that they should do so. (Cheers.) Do you say that it would be a Christian attitude for men to say that they will have nothing to do with a conference on a point which they have never incorporated with any standard of their Church, although they no doubt believe it to be in accordance with Scripture; and to demand as the condition of negotiating that you are to abandon what you consider a question of principle, and although your own conscience tells you that you cannot abandon it in faithfulness to your Lord and Master? I don’t think matters have, as yet, assumed any such aspect. I see that our United Presbyterian brethren are practically more favourable to the Established Church, which, according to their theory, is altogether an Antichristian institution, than we are—(laughter and applause)—I see that their ministers exchange pulpits with the ministers of the Establishment—(renewed laughter and applause)—and we see their people flocking to the Established Church from time to time. (Laughter and applause.) I won’t enter into these particulars, but there are some facts which have been brought before me during this very General Assembly, which show that they must either lower their principles or heighten their practice. (Loud laughter and cheers.) Besides, if any one will look at the answers which have been given in regard to those testing questions, we see that our friends are, for instance, prepared for the endowment of chaplains by the civil authorities in certain circumstances which they call exceptions, but the

ordinances of Christ do not admit of exceptions. (Applause and laughter.) If the universal standing order of Christ be against a thing, surely it can never be right. Well, when I look at those things to which I have referred on the part of our friends, I do not despair in the least; but, on the other hand, I see the greatest mischief of a practical kind likely to result if we proceed without further knowledge. Even if we could see our way past that point of theory, there is the greatest mischief of a practical kind that will result from the theory in question. It is all very well to say, as Dr Rainy has said, that we must trust to good feeling. It is quite right to do so up to a certain point; but we are not to shut our eyes to the undoubted consequences that will result if we do not proceed with more care. For example, we have our Irish Presbyterian friends here, and we are delighted to see them; but it is quite evident that if we do not get this point cleared up, we shall have no security whatever that the present arrangement of having intercourse with them will continue. I take Dr Cairns as an example, and one of the most favourable examples that could be given in every way; and yet our excellent friend—a man who would not do an unkind thing, but who at the same time will act upon principle—made a statement on that point worthy of our consideration when it was raised in the late meeting of the United Presbyterian Synod. One speaker said—“If they (the United Presbyterian Church) went thus far, it would be difficult for them to refrain from going further, and charging the deputation to represent to the Irish Assembly its disapprobation of the position which the Irish Presbyterian Church held. Could that emanate from the United Church without a strong protest on the part of this (the United Presbyterian) section of the then United Church? Would the Moderator, or Dr Cairns himself, consent to act upon the deputation?” Dr Cairns’s reply was—“It was distinctly understood in the whole of the discussion that it would be a perfectly open question in the Free Church to appoint or not to appoint that deputation; but that if it were carried by a majority, I for one would take leave to enter my decided protest.” How could friendly intercourse be carried on in these circumstances? We were flatly told in committee that the members of the Irish deputation would not come back very often in all probability, and that the matter would soon terminate itself. (Laughter.) Our Church must, I believe, look at that as one of the inevitable consequences of our going on without some better knowledge of what will be the probable results. And then there is another question that we have never considered at all; I think it is one of great importance in connexion with this idea of the ordinances of Christ. It is this—and it is a very consistent inference from that aspect of the truth, which, I believe, however, has no foundation in Scripture—viz., that inasmuch as Christ’s ordinances exclude the magistrate from providing anything for the support of the Church, it is a lawful thing to resist the magistrate in doing anything of that kind. We have the most sustained resistance in this city on the subject. (Hear, hear.) Some imagined that when what was regarded as the peculiarity of that matter was brought to an end, there would be no further resistance; but I saw at a late meeting, and I see by a subsequent letter, that the application of the principle is far more extensive, and that it is likely to

be far more permanent, as it will be brought in connexion with the repairs or renewals on manses or churches. I have just to say that this, to my mind, is nothing short of rebellion against Cæsar within his own province. (Hear, and applause.) I hold that Cæsar is entitled to be obeyed in all matters that pertain to his province. Christ himself settled that point when He said—"Show me a penny; whose image and superscription is this? Render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and unto God the things that are God's." Are we without further conference to import such questions as these into the Assembly? and will that tend to unity or to the promotion of the cause of Christ? People say, Why reappoint the committee, if you don't see your way to give up that first head of the programme? It is just because I do not see my way to do so that I am anxious for the reappointment of the committee. Men dare to speak of disingenuousness on the part of their brethren; I cast back the imputation with scorn. (Loud cheers.) I believe that there is much room for conference still, and I say in the face of those who would bring about a summary decision of this question, that they will shut us up to the double responsibility of sacrificing the principles of our Church, and of sacrificing all hope of a union which is worth having. (Loud cheers.) But there is far worse than this; and I wish to look, before sitting down, at these other matters of a very serious kind that are involved in the programme. I have a great objection to piecemeal decisions on such an important question as this. (Loud applause.) I hold that the decision should be a comprehensive one, and should proceed on a conjunct view of all the points at issue. Look, for example, at the second head of the programme itself. I do not intend to enter into it beyond this. I did not vote for the declaration of my friend Dr Wood on a late occasion. Though I had hitherto taken no part in that matter, yet I must say that while refraining from voting on that occasion, as I object to anything like a new statement, or to anything like a new creed, I was not satisfied. I had not been at any of the previous discussions; but I left the meeting with the impression that there was something that required to be cleared up; and the letters which have been published since have strengthened that impression. (Hear, hear.) But passing from this, let me come to the question of worship. In these days it is quite as possible to corrupt the whole Church through the rites of worship as by any other process; and it is a remarkable fact that in England this is the very process which the Tractarians have had recourse to, after having found that all their other plans had been failures. (Hear, hear, and cheers.) They are now endeavouring to flood the Church of England with ritualism; and it is well for us to consider what are the principles which ought to regulate worship, and whether we are really agreed with our friends on the other side in the main tenor of their principles. I am equally delighted with the union committee to find that we appear to agree on that subject. In that committee it was said that "all agree in declaring that, according to the language of the last sentence of section first, chap. 21st, that the acceptable way of worshipping the true God is instituted by Himself, and so limited by His own revealed will, that He may not be worshipped according to the imaginations and devices of men, or the suggestions of Satan, under any visible representation, or any other way

not prescribed in the Holy Scripture." That was the principle upon which I understood we had entirely agreed; but the discussions which have since taken place, make it quite plain that, so far as I can see, we are not agreed, nor anything like agreed, on the maintenance and application of those principles. And here I am exceedingly glad that we have both Dr Candlish and Dr Buchanan on our side, and strongly on our side; for Dr Candlish, in a very able preface to the work of Dr Porteous of Glasgow, and in reference to the introduction of organs into churches, made, among other things, the following statement:—"It is enough to say that it is inconsistent with Presbyterianism. Those Presbyterians who disapprove on conscientious and scriptural grounds of a particular mode of worship—as, for instance, of the organ—cannot divest themselves of responsibility merely by excluding it from their own congregation—they are bound to resist the introduction of it in all other congregations of the Church as well as in their own. . . . All who are conscientiously opposed to it—who regard it as inexpedient and unlawful, unauthorised and unscriptural—must feel themselves bound as Presbyterians to do their utmost against a proposal to have it even tolerated." And then he goes on to say—"Is there a trace in the New Testament of any other mode of praise? For my part, I am persuaded that if the organ be admitted, there is no barrier in principle against the sacerdotal system in all its fulness, against the substitution again in our whole religion of the formal for the spiritual, the symbolical for the real." I agree in every syllable of that, and I have no doubt that we shall all agree on these principles. Well, in the discussion which took place in this Assembly in 1858, Dr Buchanan, after making a very clear statement to the same effect, said—"This he would say, that on the supposition Mr Menteith had made, if the Presbyterian Church in England were to go the length he pointed at, and actually to sanction the introduction of the organ, then, while he should continue with all his heart to hold Catholic communion with that Church as he would with the United Presbyterian Church, and with many other Churches, he would take the responsibility of moving the repeal of the law by which ministers of the Presbyterian Church in England could be translated to charges in the Free Church." If Dr Buchanan has not changed his mind, it is surely right that we should see, before we go a step further, whether we are not sure to have, not only in the forms of a sister Church, but in the very midst of our own United Church, this matter imported as one of probable difficulty. (Hear and applause.) For in the recent discussions in the United Presbyterian Synod, there was a very remarkable division. 136 members voted for the introduction of the organ to 232 who voted that it was "inexpedient in present circumstances." "Inexpedient" only "in present circumstances" to entertain the prayer of the memorialists. Only two men, so far as I could see, said one word on the subject as a matter of principle. Dr Cairns, while holding himself precluded from voting with the minority, says, with wonderful frankness—"I cannot support the view which I held before, which I hold still, and which, if I were on the floor of a United Church, I would state afresh," &c. Well, there is the importation of a most serious question in this, if settled, we cannot get it outside by endeavouring to persuade our friends that the principle to which we unanimously agreed does exclude in-

strumental music, as well as all the other parts of the temple service. I do not refer to the matter of hymns, just because I do not want to enter upon every topic, but our friends who have strong feelings on the subject should understand that that will come in, I have no doubt, along with the general furniture. (Laughter.) I wish to say a word or two on a matter on which Dr Rainy touched, but did not touch to my mind with sufficient fulness. I leave others to discuss the question of education. I wish to say a word or two about the Sustentation Fund. I was sorry I could not be present here yesterday when proposals were submitted to the Assembly; but let me say that I am not to be held committed to any alterations that may be made. I hold by the Sustentation Fund, but there is no man more anxious that our brethren throughout the country should be better—far better supported than they are. Still, I believe that the Sustentation Fund has accomplished a result such as has never been accomplished in any other way by any other Church, except by means of an establishment; and in some respects I believe it has been far more effectual than even an Established Church. Some may be ready to say, Would you peril the union upon such a question as this? I say that those who put that question ought to put it to themselves. How will the question stand if you are left to discuss it at last as part of a complex question? I for one would be prepared to say that so vastly important is it that the maintenance of the Church in many parts of the kingdom, under God, wholly depends upon it, and that if you were by any process to destroy it you would destroy the maintenance of the ordinances of truth over wide districts of the country. I think, then, it would be warrantable, at the very least, to pause before passing any such resolution whatever as would affect this fund. And I have no hesitation in saying that, without better guarantee, the immediate effect of union would be to strike a death-blow at that scheme. I do not wish to enter into all the parts of this subject, but there is one thing which in itself would destroy the Sustentation Fund—I mean the making of it optional in the United Church. You cannot have two schemes working together, because the one would be worked in such a way as to be antagonistic to the other. The people in one church would be asked twelve times in the year for a contribution, and those in another only at the time of seat-letting. I say that that could not continue. If you make it optional to support the Sustentation Fund or no, the rich congregations, to a large extent—those who have not been accustomed to support the Sustentation Fund—would, I believe, be slow to join it, and if that option was taken by the congregations on the other side, our congregations might claim the same privilege, and in a very short time I believe the fund would sink. I am not speaking on mere theory, for what was the history of the Sustentation Fund in Canada? When I was there I had a conversation, till two in the morning, with a man who was a great financier; and as such could not take in anything but matters of finance—working with a slate, while all our finance is connected with moral questions and the spiritual condition of the people. I could not make anything of him, but I said—“Mark my words—if your complex optional scheme is allowed to take place, it will go down within a short time.” And it did so, and they have no fund whatever in the Canadian Church, and have not had for years. Now, I just wish to say to our brethren, let us come to some

better understanding on this subject before we venture to pronounce any judgment. I think we are, in all fairness, entitled to ask this. Allow me now to look for a moment at the two motions. Dr Candlish's motion is, of course, skillfully worded—(laughter)—and has been made more plausible even since it was first laid on the table; but still it contains this in it, that we are now and here to affirm that we see no bar to the union contemplated in the first head of the programme, and then observe what you do in addition to that. It is quite natural for those who take that view to instruct the committee never to look again at the first head of the programme. On that footing you would go on to make your arrangements in such a way that you will never get more light on the subject. You say, "As at present advised," and you take care to exclude all further advice that arises in the progress of the negotiations. You "reserve final judgment," but I should like to know what difference there is in this case between an interim and a final judgment? Now, why do you resist all further light on the subject? Why, if you think it so clear and plain, do you fence it round with so many conditions, reserving your final judgment and so forth? I think I could tell you, but I shall not. (Laughter.) But I for one totally object to this Assembly meantime deciding anything of the kind. I believe it is beyond its competency to do it; and I will warn the brethren that this is a matter not to be settled by a mere vote of this Church. (Hear.) It is a very solemn question indeed, and having thoroughly considered it, I speak for myself and others in saying that it cannot be decided by a mere vote. No doubt men say, Where is the constitutional principle that is involved? I say there is this constitutional principle, that this Assembly has not been sent here to do this work. It is an Assembly appointed to discharge the ordinary business of the Church. I believe it is only so entitled to act, being merely a representative body, and two-thirds of the ministers being outside the door, you are not entitled to change the creed of the Church. (Hear, hear.) You are not entitled to make any vital alteration upon the principles of the Church. If any one would think for a moment he would see this. If you pronounce "as at present advised," you might resolve that you saw no reason why there should not be a perpetual moderator; that, "as at present advised," you saw no reason why this should not be a prelatial Church; or, what would come nearer, that you see no reason why you should not re-unite with the old Established Church. (Hear and laughter.) Ah, we should then hear a great deal about the constitutional principles of the Church. (Hear.) This is simply one of those cases where a man, when he has made up his mind about a thing, can see past a great many corners that strike others who are not so clear about it. (Hear and laughter.) I say it is beyond the province of the Church to dispose of any part of this question *ad interim*. You say, what are we to do? Well, I would do what my motion proposes. I would tell the committee to go back and finish its work, and bring up to us a complete analysis of that programme with the ultimate results and with definite proposals. Then, I would not have the Assembly even then to come to an interim judgment. I would have the Assembly to send them down to Presbyteries and instruct them to consult all ministers, and also instruct them specially to consult their congregations—sound them as to what their state of feeling is in connexion with this union

matter. (Cheers and hear.) Only after having obtained all that information would I proceed to do the thing we are asked to do now and at once. I am exceedingly glad that since our friends the deputies from America thought it right to speak on this question, though my opinion, with all respect for them, is that it is better for strangers not to speak on questions which perhaps they do not understand fully,—I am exceedingly glad to import a piece of good advice from America. It is a very practical country, and if an American tells you to go very quick—I beg to tell you from experience—in travelling, for example—he goes very cautiously himself. (Laughter.) Well, they have a union—a far easier union than ours—and they have resolved as follows:—I read from the *American Presbyterian*, which came yesterday:—“The report will be laid before both Assemblies”—(remember it is a complete report)—“and in the near approach of the meeting, it is regarded inexpedient to make it public.” (That is another piece of good sense.) “It is, however, proper to say that no hasty action is counselled; it is proposed that a year be given for full discussion before any formal action is initiated, and the committee recommend that the vote of three-fourths of the Presbyteries in both bodies be made necessary for ratification, whenever the sense of the Church is taken.” Well, I call that good sense. We have hitherto been discussing this matter very much in private, and have had opportunity to know very little of the feelings of the people. Even if you were able to decide the question in that state of matters, it would be wrong. If you pretend to decide this question now—now, even *ad interim*, without going to your people—and that virtually is the state of the matter—if you do that, you will find every congregation in the Free Church divided and torn in pieces on the subject—(hear)—and probably the Free Church itself placed in a difficulty out of which it will never extricate itself. I do therefore earnestly press upon the Assembly the importance of suspending their judgment upon this whole matter until it is more fully investigated, and until we have a full and final report before us, and time enough to consider it. Upon the decision of this night, I repeat, will in my opinion depend the future, probably the very fate of the Free Church, humanly speaking. When, some time ago, we brought up from Tanfield our unanswered and unanswerable protest to the very door of the old Assembly Hall, little did we think that this noble hall was to become the grave and mausoleum of that protest. (Hisses and cheers.) I have no hesitation in saying, in reference to the appeal which has been made to us in regard to the times which are passing over us, that I look at the matter very differently indeed from my excellent friends on the other side. I think I can say something in regard to the struggle with Romanism, in which I have taken some little part. (Hear, hear.) But I have yet to learn that some of those men have done anything, or are likely to do anything, to give us effective aid in that struggle; and in that struggle I do not think that anything will avail but the uncompromising maintenance of His truth, and especially the maintenance of the Headship of Christ over the nations, in opposition to the pretended supremacy of a usurping vicar who sits in the temple of God, and shows himself to be God. The people of this country have looked to us, as representatives of the old Reformers, of the men who faithfully maintained these principles for so many years.

And if we are prepared to give up these principles, it would be strange to see it done at this time. It is just three hundred years this year since the Church of Scotland was endowed by the civil magistrate. During all the interval—through many dark and troubled days—the old principles have been maintained through good and bad report, and now, without a struggle, it is proposed to give them up, and to haul down the old blue flag in the sight of the country and of the world. (Hear.) No, my friends. Shall we do it when we know the future? I care nothing about what people say about expectation. What do I care about expectation? I know that Jesus reigns, and must reign, until He has put all enemies under His feet. I know and maintain, as a proper homage to Him, that the nations shall serve Him with their substance. I for one will resist, in every competent form—anxious as I am for union, and while I have laboured in committee to bring about a right state of feeling—I will resist any attempt to destroy the testimony which we have maintained, and especially to destroy it probably within hearing of the advancing footsteps of the Prince of Life, and of that great proclamation which is to go up under the whole heaven—“The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord and of His Christ.” (Applause.)

Mr DENNY, (elder,) in seconding the motion of Dr Begg, said he had always heard ministers of the Church regretting that so few of the laity took part in the discussions of the Assembly. Now, he appeared there not only to speak for himself, but also for such of the laity as might hold the same views as he did about the union movement. If there was anything disagreeable to himself in the position he now took up, it was in appearing in opposition to their reverend father and his (Mr Denny's) most esteemed of all friends, Dr Candlish—(hear, hear)—but he resolved to follow the course he now did after a full consideration of both motions before the House. On first reading Dr Candlish's motion, he thought that he saw his way clear to agreeing with him, but he found that he was mistaken, and Dr Buchanan's eloquent appeal had left a most disagreeable impression on his mind—namely, that a sort of coercion was brought to bear upon the Assembly by the threat of dissolving the committee; but with all deference to Dr Buchanan, he thought that if the responsibility of such a disastrous consequence should come to pass, it would devolve entirely upon the other side. He was not prepared to accept the first head of the programme so implicitly as Dr Buchanan, or those who supported him; and he would just say that, if there was so little difference between the negotiating Churches on this first head as was represented, what was the use of Dr Buchanan holding over the heads of the Assembly the threat of breaking up the conference? (Hear, hear, and laughter.) He for one declined to be committed to the matter of union in detail. He wanted the whole project before him before he said “Yea” or “Nay.” (Hear, hear, and applause.) While saying this, however, he begged to assure the Assembly that he was sincerely and truly anxious for union with the United Presbyterian brethren, and was prepared to make personal sacrifices to accomplish it. He was not pledged in his own mind to any particular course when the issue of this union movement came up. He was not bound to any party or to follow this or that doctor of divinity—(laughter)—but was as free to act upon his own judgment, at the proper time, as any man in the Assembly. (Applause.)

Dr JULIUS WOOD rose to speak, when

Mr ADAM, Aberdeen, said—While it will be perfectly right and proper that all parties should have opportunity to speak, I would make this observation, that I trust members of the union committee will feel that, while they are not to be excluded from a fair share in this discussion—(hear, hear)—they will endeavour to give those outside the committee, who have had very little opportunity of expressing their opinions, the fullest liberty.

Mr NIXON—I beg it to be understood, then, that members of the committee will assert their full right as members of this Assembly. (“Hear, hear,” and applause.)

Mr ADAM—Of course. (Continued applause, and cries of “order.”)

Mr NIXON—The members, generally, will be the better able to speak on what has been done in the committee after they are told of it; and they cannot be told of it unless we are allowed to tell it. (Hear, hear.)

Dr GIBSON—At a former Assembly I made this statement, that as a member of that committee—and my opinion was publicly canvassed and misrepresented—I must have as full a right as any member of their House to state my views. I say that still, whether it may compromise the time Mr Adam may wish to make a speech in or not. (Applause.)

Dr CANDLISH said Mr Adam, while he wished as full liberty as possible for members generally to speak, did not wish to interfere with the right of any individual in the House.

Dr WOOD said—I present myself thus early in the debate, because, as a dissident from the findings of the committee on both the heads of the programme, I may, in following up my dissent, be able to lay before the House statements that may be useful in the debate on the important question now before the General Assembly. I am strongly impressed with the conviction that, in what are called the articles of agreement under the first head of the programme, there is, to a considerable extent, a covering up of differences rather than a statement of agreement; and I will try to tell you why I have this conviction. The first head of the programme, the relation of the civil magistrate to religion and the Church, occupied the union committee the whole of the first year after our appointment. Our report to the Assembly, 1864, was wholly silent on this matter of the civil magistrate. And it has occupied much the larger portion of our time and attention during the whole year since last Assembly. Very nearly two years have thus been spent by the union committee exclusively on this question of the civil magistrate. We were occupied all that time in what we sometimes called *minimising the difference*. Now, it does occur to one either that the difference between us in the committee was at first very great, or that the work of *minimising* was very hard and difficult, seeing it required so long a time and so many meetings. And I have no difficulty in saying that there is truth in both views, that there was a great difference between us when we began our negotiations, and that we have found it hard work in dealing with that difference. Be it observed, the difference between us to which I refer, does not relate merely or chiefly to the matter of endowments. That difference was recognised and admitted at the very first, and, without any difficulty or expense of time, was embodied in what we have called our distinctive articles. It is matters of difference between the Churches, outside the question of endowments, that have occupied the union com-

mittee for about two years out of the four that have elapsed since their appointment—matters outside the question of endowment altogether, I repeat. Is not this proof that there is much more between the Churches than the question of endowments? We made up our mind at the very first that there was a difference about endowments; no time was spent by us on that. And if there was no other difference, what have we been doing all these two years, and in those innumerable, anxious, weary meetings that we held on the first head of the programme? What is the meaning of our being so laboriously and anxiously, and for so long a time engaged in minimising the difference, if, in point of fact, there be little or no difference to minimise. I hold that our numerous and anxious meetings prove that we felt there is a difference between us and Voluntaryism, outside of, and over and above the question of endowments. (Hear.) But it may be said that this great difference was only a supposed one, that it was a mere misapprehension of one another, and that through the conferences that have taken place the misapprehensions have been cleared away. Hard work it has been to clear away the misapprehension, if it has been no more than misapprehension. But if you had heard the earnest statements and debates, meeting after meeting, throughout these two years, you would have felt that there was surely more than a mere misapprehension between us—that there was some hard, dry reality, which it was found very difficult to grapple with and get out of the way. Surely if we had really been at one on the relation of the civil magistrate to the Church, apart from the endowment question, we would have been able to find out the agreement, and state it distinctly, in much less time than two years, with their numerous and protracted meetings. But the truth is, we found there was a difference besides the endowment question, and we have been occupied these two years in trying to bring one another into the views that we respectively held regarding the relation of the rulers of nations to religion and the Church. In my judgment, we have met with indifferent success in this our long and laborious work. For what have we done? We have carefully, at much expense of time and talk, selected and arranged phrases and expressions, and carefully weighed and balanced statements and sentences; and the result is, no doubt, a fair appearance of agreement; and I have no doubt it is looked upon as such in many quarters. In some quarters, however, not so. But when I think of the difficulties encountered in the committee in selecting and adjusting the phrases and sentences, and the sentiments which were ever and anon coming out in debate on both sides, I feel persuaded that not intentionally but really the result has been, to a large extent, the covering up of differences rather than the statement of a real and true agreement. To explain and make good what I mean, I have to remark that it is one of the leading principles of Voluntaryism to regard the civil magistrate simply in the same light as any other Christian man—an obligation lying on him, as on all men, to act in accordance with the revealed will of God as an individual man, like all other individual men, whatever their trade, or profession, or office may be. Our view of the civil magistrate is, that in addition to what belongs to him and is incumbent on him as a Christian man, like other Christian men, he is bound *officially* and *as a magistrate* to countenance and promote religion and the cause of Christ. Now, these two views of the magistrate and his duty to the Church and religion are very different,—the magistrate simply as a Christian man, acting on Chris-

tian principles ; and the magistrate, further, *qua* magistrate and officially, seeking to promote Christ's cause. It was between these two principles that the battle was really waged in the many anxious meetings of the union committee during the two years out of the four that have elapsed since their appointment. It may seem, when you look at the articles of agreement, that whatever difference there existed between the views of our Voluntary brethren and our own has been removed in these conferences, and that we are now at one. It is here, I think, that the fallacy is to be found. There is an apparent agreement, but I believe the original and real difference remains—covered up, not removed. For observe, you have both the language that expresses the Voluntary view, and that which expresses our view of the civil magistrate, used in the articles of agreement—"like other Christians," and "as a magistrate." Now, I have to tell the Assembly that we had many a hard battle to fight to get in the words "as a magistrate ;" if I mistake not, they were out and in several times, as the tide of battle inclined to this side or that ; and when the expression, "by his official acts," was proposed to be used, it was objected to and withdrawn. Covered up, then, and very much out of sight, is the distinction between the magistrate simply as a Christian man, which is the Voluntary view of him ; and the magistrate not only as a Christian man, but also as a magistrate and officially furthering the cause of Christ, which is our view of his position and duty. You can find the language of both of the views in the articles of agreement. Not that it is so by design, but probably from the strong desire and earnest persevering endeavour of each party to have their own views brought out and expressed in the articles. And the consequence is, that some interpret them as meaning one thing, and some as meaning another. Many Free Churchmen, I believe, regard them as containing a goodly measure of Free Church principles. They think that we have brought the Voluntaries a great way up from their principles towards ours, and that we may hope, if time is given us, to talk them into being true and real Free Churchmen. (Applause.) On their part, the Voluntaries generally vehemently deny that they have moved one step from their position, or that they have given up any of their principles. And I take leave to remark that their speeches and conduct on public questions show that their estimate of themselves is right—that they have in no degree been induced to give up their principles, and that the judgment of some of our friends to the contrary is a mistake. And with regard to the articles of agreement, many Voluntaries are greatly dissatisfied with them because of their ambiguity, or because they think that they compromise Voluntary principles. And I am convinced that the Voluntaries generally do not accept the articles of agreement—that they are not willing to become Free Churchmen, even leaving out of sight, and setting aside the matter of endowments. I repeat it, that the Voluntaries are not prepared to become Free Churchmen by accepting the articles of agreement—a thing which they would do if these articles of agreement do contain and conserve the principles of the Free Church. But, then, some one will point me to the recent decisions of the United Presbyterian Synod as a proof that the United Presbyterian Church almost unanimously accepts these articles of agreement. I must be permitted to say that the motion which became the judgment of the United Presbyterian Synod is a very cleverly framed one, and has wonderfully cast

dust in the eyes of the public. It has generally been supposed to contain a cordial acceptance of the articles of agreement by the United Presbyterian Church. It does no such thing. It only expresses *satisfaction at the amount of harmony, &c.*, a very different thing from concurring in the articles and adopting them. If the United Presbyterian Synod had been asked to concur in these articles, as many people think they actually have done, undoubtedly the Synod would have refused. What, then, is really the meaning of the deliverance of the United Presbyterian Synod? It is just this, that all matters of difference between the Free and United Presbyterian Churches be made an open question. And if we were to go into that, as Dr Rainy's motion really asks us to do, however much its meaning and effects are masked, it would just be our handing over the Free Church to the United Presbyterians. Surely we are not prepared for that yet! But you deny that my interpretation of the judgment of the United Presbyterian Synod is correct, do you? I will prove that it is correct. I think that the judgment bears on the face of it that it is not an acceptance of, and a concurrence in, the articles of agreement. (Hear, hear.) But let that pass. I ask you to look at the "suggestions" by the Presbyteries of the United Presbyterian Church to their union committee. There are thirty-one Presbyteries in the United Presbyterian Church. All these sent in to their union committee suggestions on the first head of the programme—the office of the civil magistrate, and his relation to religion and the Church. I quote from the United Presbyterian summary. Twelve of these United Presbyterian Presbyteries regard the articles of agreement as unsatisfactory—the phraseology inexplicit or ambiguous. Fourteen specify matters to be reconsidered or inquired into. All the Presbyteries, in terms more or less explicit, hold by the principle of forbearance on the province of the magistrate in relation to religion and the Church. Twenty-nine Presbyteries (out of the thirty-one) expressly, or by implication, recommend forbearance to the extent to which diversity of opinion exists among the negotiating Churches. Not merely, be it observed, on the matter of endowments, but to the extent to which diversity of opinion exists among the negotiating Churches, the whole of the Presbyteries hold by the principle of forbearance on the province of the magistrate in relation to religion and the Church. Now it is all these Presbyteries who had sent up these suggestions on the first head of the programme that constituted the United Presbyterian Synod; they were all there, or were entitled to be there. Any motion asking a concurrence in the articles of agreement other than an expression of their gratification in a very general way at what was called the measure of harmony in the committee, could not be ventured on. The motion that would find acceptance in the United Presbyterian Synod must evidently be one declaring either explicitly or by implication that there can be no incorporative union between the Free and United Presbyterian Churches unless on the condition that the province of the magistrate in relation to religion and the Church be made a matter of forbearance—in other words, an open question. The motion was constructed accordingly on that principle, and it was so understood and adopted by the Synod almost unanimously, as being really and truly the echo of the suggestions sent in by the whole of these Presbyteries, to the effect that in all the negotiations for union they should hold fast by the principle of forbearance or open questions on all matters of difference between the Churches. And so the United Presbyterian Church now

comes to us and tells us that the United Presbyterian Church is ready to unite with the Free Church on the ground of the first head of the programme, as it at present stands, on condition that all differences that may be found covered up in it shall be made matter of forbearance—in other words, an open question. Or to express it in the language of both the United Presbyterian motion and that of Dr Rainy, that, under the first head of the programme, there is no insuperable bar to union, provided all matters of difference between the Churches be left an open question. These differences may be great or little. Some in the United Presbyterian Church think them the one and some the other. But that was scarcely a disturbing element in the vote, because the motion was understood to mean that the differences between the Churches, under the first head of the programme, be they many or few, be they great or little, are to be made open questions. The motion, and the nearly unanimous support which it received (a support which fairly took the public, who did not look narrowly into the matter, by surprise) is a polite way of inviting us all to become United Presbyterians. No wonder, when it costs them nothing, that there was so much unanimity in the Synod. Rather it is a wonder that there should have been found in the United Presbyterian Synod 39 members who could not see their way to join with their brethren in inviting us Free Churchmen to become United Presbyterians. For, what does the United Presbyterian Church give up in this bargain? Nothing. They remain just as they are—all their principles intact. What does the Free Church give up? Much that is true and precious, and that she was wont in other days highly to value. She gives up her historical position as the real historical Presbyterian Church of Scotland. She gives up the broad full testimony which she has ever borne to the entire crown rights of the Lord Jesus Christ as King of nations. She is told (we were told in the joint-union committee) that she will have immediately to fight on the floor of the supposed United Church for liberty to hold her present fellowship with our brethren of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland—to fight also immediately on the floor of the supposed United Church for her Education Scheme, and for her Sustentation Fund. And we are distinctly warned from the United Presbyterian Synod itself, that as soon as this union is consummated, there is forthwith to be a great fight on the floor of the United Church for the introduction of organs into our places of worship. With all these differences now existing between the Churches, and with all these other things looming in the not distant future after the union has taken place, are we at liberty, as custodiers of God's truth, to commit the Free Church of Scotland to this proposed union by the adoption of Dr Rainy's motion, as far as such an act of the General Assembly would be of any authority? For assuredly the adoption of this motion really and truly compromises the Church, and commits her to union, as far as the decision of any one Assembly can commit us. On the other hand, Dr Begg's motion, whilst putting no bar in the way of continuing the negotiations, keeps the Church perfectly free till she has the whole case before her, and has all the elements before her for forming a ripe and correct judgment on the whole matter and every single part of it. It is true the motion of Dr Rainy tells us that *final judgment* is to be reserved. Let not the General Assembly be deceived by this expression. There may be a formal final judgment, but this that you are called today to give by Dr Rainy is assuredly the determining judgment, with

which the final judgment must fall in. The judgment asked to-day is the judgment which pronounces sentence. The final judgment mentioned in the motion is only the warrant for execution. (Applause.) We all know what a dissected map is. The putting it together is a good exercise for young geographers. By a little patience, pains, and geographical knowledge, each piece is selected, and fitted into its own place, which it easily and exactly occupies, and the result is a complete and accurate map, without any holes in it, and without any portion of the country being wanting. But if the boy who is putting it together, taking up a piece, thinks that it fits a place that he has in his eye, but finds that it only very nearly fits it—that it would fit it were it not for a certain knob or projection, and so takes out his knife and cuts off the knob, and then fits in the piece, which does pretty well, though he thinks it does look a little awkward after all. Having once begun with this cutting off knobs and projections, he finds that he needs to repeat it. And when his labour is done and the map complete, and he has cut off a good many knobs and projections to make the pieces fit, he finds that he has not made a very good job of it—that there are a number of holes in the map—vacant places, none of which should have been, and that a good many countries and towns which were on the knobs and projections that he had cut off had partially or altogether disappeared. (Laughter and applause.) I am afraid that the work of the union committee is too like the doings of the impatient boy trying thus to put together his dissected map. The union committee finds it difficult to get a number of things to fit into this projected incorporative union. These things obstinately refuse to take the place which we in our eagerness think they should occupy. There are sundry knobs and projections that stand in the way. But if these things don't at once fit into the union, they must be made to do it; the knobs and projections must be cut off, and so we are trying to cut off one knob after another, and get all the pieces that must go into our union map disposed of one way or another. But then let us think what will be the appearance of our map after our stand-in-the-way projections and knobs have been all cut off. There will be many open spaces. We will miss many things that we once deemed exceedingly important, and that once stood high in our favour. There will no longer be found in the reconstructed map of an incorporative union Church our Claim of Rights so ably and on such solid grounds drawn up by our very able and much-respected legal adviser, Mr Dunlop, and so ably advocated on the floor of the House of Commons by the Right Hon. Fox Maule, now my Lord Dalhousie. (Applause.) Our protest, which was laid on the table of the Assembly by Dr Welsh on the 18th of May 1843 in old St Andrew's, and which lies on the table of the Established Church Assembly to this day, still unanswered and unanswerable, will be found—half of it at least—to have disappeared, removed by our own recreant hand. There will be a great hole in our model trust-deed, if indeed the whole parchment be not, in the attempt to get it into the union map, torn to shreds, and given to the winds at Old Tanfield, with its fragrant and glorious memories, we shall hardly be able to find or recognise it on our union map. If we can detect it at all, it will seem as if looming through a cold thick eastern "haar." (Applause.) I respectfully ask the indulgence of the General Assembly for a few minutes longer, whilst I take up for a little the subject of doctrine—that subject to which the

them. I follow no doctor's lead, but I rise as an independent member of this Assembly; not in the vain expectation of adding anything new to this discussion, but to give expression to the hope that no difference of opinion on secondary or subordinate points will be allowed to act as a barrier to the union of those brethren who have one Lord, one faith, one baptism.

I believe that many of the difficulties that stand in the way of union are to be found in the regions of feeling and prejudice, and I think nothing is better calculated to dissipate those little clouds of opposition which ever and anon arise, than a hearty expression of opinion, in favour of union, on the part of the laity of our Church. It is quite time that our laity had spoken out decidedly on this subject. The taunt has been frequently thrown out that they take little interest in it. I believe no taunt is more unfounded. The great majority of the laity do take an interest in it, and they long for its consummation. It is true that they have hitherto taken but little part in the discussion, and I don't wonder at it. They have been perplexed and bewildered by those subtle distinctions in which the clerical mind seems to revel—(laughter)—but when it comes to be a question, "Whether or not the difference of opinion that exists in regard to State support of religion is a warrantable ground of separation?" the case is different. This is a thing the laity can understand.

If there be no substantial difference between the position and tenets of the negotiating Churches except on this one subject—if they all hold the principles of the Confession of Faith in regard to the duty of civil magistrates to own allegiance to Christ, to act for the furtherance of His cause, and to take the Word of God for their rule—surely the question of State support to religion, which is only an inference from the general principles of the Confession, may be left as a question of mutual love and forbearance. It is an impossibility to rear a Church, or govern a Church, on any other principle than that of mutual forbearance on some points. It would be a foolish theory to expect a dead, useless unity, by making all the members of a Church think alike. Is there a Church in existence at this time, the members of which are all of one mind on every point of Bible truth? And if absolute unanimity is impossible on so important a subject as this, surely a matter so subordinate and so shadowy as the State support of religion may be left as a matter of forbearance too.

But where is the argument in favour of State endowments to be found? Dr Begg says, if the argument for a State Endowment is not found in the 23d chapter of the Confession of Faith, it will be found in the proofs from Scripture on which the text of that chapter is based. They refer us to the text in Isaiah that foretells that kings shall be nursing fathers, and their queens nursing mothers, as establishing the principle of National Endowments; but this is a sordid result to attach to so glorious a promise. (Laughter.) I believe the time predicted by Isaiah will come, when even kings shall acknowledge that the glory of the Lord has risen on the Church; when they shall devote themselves and all their influence to the Lord; when that influence, which has often been used against Christ, shall be used for Him; when those restrictions and penalties which are enforced by many governments at this day against the spread of the gospel shall be removed; when the laws that are passed shall be founded on God's Word, and have a regard to His glory: and in this way kings and governments may become

nursing fathers to the Church of Christ in a more exalted sense than by giving it mere money support. Why, sir, this text in Isaiah, if taken literally, will carry us much further than a State Endowment. Taken literally, the words in this same verse, "They shall bow down to thee with their face toward the earth, and lick up the dust of thy feet," would justify the Papal usurpation to trample on the necks of kings. (Applause.) And as to the verses from Ezra, I can imagine the mind of Artaxerxes being influenced by a ready scribe in the law of Moses, as Ezra was, and awed by the recital of the signs the Lord had shown and the wonders He had done in the land of Ham ;—I can imagine Artaxerxes doing all that he did, not with any desire of bringing glory and honour to God, but from some blind and superstitious feeling awing and controlling him ; I can imagine Artaxerxes doing all this, and much more, for the sake of securing the favour of a God of whose power he had heard so much ; for, as he says in the letter he gave to Ezra, "Why should there be wrath against the realm of the king and his sons ?" The hearts of kings are in the hands of God, and He turns them as He will. When God's purposes are to be accomplished, He raises up men to do them, from whom such service was never expected. But if this passage from Ezra is an argument in favour of State Endowments, the twenty-fourth verse of this chapter is an argument for the exemption of the ministers of a State Church, and "the porters and singers" employed about the sanctuary, from the payment of toll, tribute, and custom—and this, of course, would include the Income Tax. (Loud laughter.) The 25th verse is an argument in favour of the Church appointing magistrates and judges ; and the 26th verse is an authority to imprison, banish, and even kill all persons who are found guilty of disobeying the law of God. Are our friends who argue for taking the proofs as well as the text as the Confession, prepared to take the literal meaning of these proofs ? Are they prepared to go the lengths their argument would lead them ? (Applause.)

In the days of Nehemiah there were men who laughed at him for seeking to build the ruined walls of Jerusalem ; so there are men now who cry out, "What is this thing ye do ?" when we seek to unite the scattered hosts of Israel ; but I say in all solemnity that these men incur a great responsibility, who, for the sake of an abstract and shadowy theory—a theory which involves no vital principle, a theory never likely to be of any practical importance, a theory which you cannot make a term of communion in our own Church—I say they incur a vast responsibility who would jeopardise the union of the Churches on such a ground as this.

But it has been said, "What is the use of uniting ? we will never agree !" This argument I cannot understand, and I can less understand Disruption ministers using it—men who experienced God's providential and guiding hand so strikingly in days gone by. This yearning for union among believers, which has in it so much that is noble and holy, I believe to be a work of God. It is not of man's seeking alone, whatever some may say. God by His Spirit seems to be leading the Churches on to seek this union ; and if in His mercy the union do take place, I have sufficient faith in God to believe that He will smooth—nay, even remove difficulties that may subsequently arise. God, who led the children of Israel in their marchings through the wilderness, did not forsake them when they came to the Red Sea. The United Church may have bitter waters to drink, but if we look

to the Lord and trust in Him, He will show us how these bitter waters may be made sweet. When God in His providence opens doors for us, and bids us enter, we dare not refuse. We must take ground as fast as Providence indicates, for it is only by doing so that His further purposes concerning us can be disclosed. Why, it would have been just as reasonable for Dr Begg and Dr Gibson never to have married, for fear that their great-great-grandchildren might quarrel over a property that they were never likely to get—(loud laughter)—as it would be for the negotiating Churches to remain single for fear their descendants might quarrel over the offer of a State Endowment.

Our fitting course is to do what is right now, without forecasting the future—to do present duty, and leave results to God. We shouldn't be deterred by fancied difficulties, for imaginary trials are often worse than real trials; and how many make themselves miserable, and others too, by predicting evils that never come to pass! (Applause.) If we engage ourselves to God's work, He will give strength and wisdom to perform it. Former mercies should cause us to anticipate fresh mercies. Jonah's case should be a warning to us. He got a command from the Lord, but thought it better to take his own way. Instead of going to Nineveh, as he was told, he thought he would run away to Tarshish, but ere long he found himself in a very different place. (Loud laughter.) Abraham's case should be an encouragement to us: "By faith Abraham, when he was called to go out to a place which he should after receive for an inheritance, obeyed, and he went out not knowing whither he went."

Questions, no doubt, will arise in the United Church about which difference of opinion may exist, but not to a greater extent than exists among ourselves at present. Are we all of one mind in the Free Church as to a scheme of National Education? (Hear, hear.) Do we all think alike as to the benefit derived by the Irish Presbyterian Church from the Regium Donum? (Hear, hear.) Do we all agree that the Government is honouring Christ, or paying Him homage, while with one hand they support truth, and with the other support error and superstition? (Applause.) Do we all act alike in matters of worship? Do we all think alike as to the principle and working of the Sustentation Scheme? (Hear, hear.) But some say, "If the union take place, what becomes of our historical identity?" A family famous in history doesn't lose its identity by uniting with a family equally illustrious; neither did Scotland lose its identity by its union with England; and I don't think the Free Church will lose its historical identity by uniting with Churches which have an historical identity of which to be proud, as well as ourselves. (Loud applause.) The names of Knox, and Melville, and Henderson belong as much to the other Churches as to us. (Hear, hear.) The Reformed Presbyterian and the United Presbyterian Churches have each maintained a noble testimony to the truth in our fathers' days, and we may consider it no little honour to have the arms of these Churches quartered with our own. Our identity will not be lost by union, but will become more intensified. We have a lineage of which we may proudly boast as Free Churchmen, but should this union take place, our children will be able to boast of an ancestry more illustrious still. It is no slight honour to point to names so great as Moncreiff, and Thomson, and Chalmers, and Cunningham; but the honour will be increased when we can unite with these names, names so illustrious as the Erskines and the Browns—when

we can speak with pride of those worthies who spent their Sabbath hours in caves and glens—men who

“To Scotland gave her Church, her laws,
And fell like patriots in their country's cause.”

But too much may be made of our historical identity. Evangelical life is not to be maintained by dwelling for ever on our historical identity, and our faithfulness as a contending and protesting Church. The very tenacity with which we make these appeals helps to weaken our sensitiveness to the deeper need we have of greater zeal for Christ, and more devotedness to His cause. The Pharisees boasted much of their historical identity. (Laughter.) They were continually declaring that they had Abraham for their father; but the reproof they got should not be forgotten by us now: “I say unto you, that God is able of these stones to raise up children unto Abraham.” Paul could boast of his historical identity. He could boast of being “of the stock of Israel, of the tribe of Benjamin, a Hebrew of the Hebrews; as touching the law, a Pharisee; concerning zeal, persecuting the Church.” But Paul set no store by all this. He could say, “But what things were gain to me, these I counted loss for Christ; yea, doubtless, and I count all things but loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus my Lord; for whom I have suffered the loss of all things, and do count them but dung, that I may win Christ, and be found in Him.” I believe that if we were to show more of Paul's earnestness to win Christ, and to do Christ's work, we would think less of those little differences which now separate us from our brethren. (Applause.) I believe that the closer we come to Christ, the closer we would come to one another. The grand work of the Church is to save souls, and were we to engage in this work with all the zeal and earnestness its importance requires, we would find ourselves more and more drawn towards those brethren who are seeking the same end, who are animated by the same zeal, and who are encouraged by the same glorious hope. Let others reap the fruit of contention and strife. Let our aim be to sow the seeds of righteousness and peace. Let it be our aim to deal with matters of vital godliness and eternal realities; with things that are plainly revealed, not with those about which differences of opinion exist to such an extent even among ourselves—(hear, hear)—matters about which so many doctors differ. (A laugh.) The great business of the Church is the old work of declaring that Jesus who is the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever; and the nearer the Church keeps to Christ, the better will it fulfil its true vocation; more good will result from a close union between the negotiating Churches than from any support a Government could give. (Applause.) It will be far better to unite with our brethren, and use our strength in battling with the hosts of ignorance and superstition. It will be far better to strive with them in leavening the mass of society with living Christian principle, for it is only in this way that we will come to have Christian magistrates and Christian rulers. (Hear, hear.) It is only in this way that legislation will come to be pervaded by a noble and enlightened Bible spirit. This will be a more practical way of securing that our rulers shall bring their glory and honour to Christ, than by maintaining a mere abstract theory of the ruler's duty to the Church. (Applause.)

Many of us seem to think that our judgments on any subject should be the rule and measure of other men's; but if we were to follow the apostolic rule—in lowliness of mind to esteem others better than ourselves—if we were to think of our judgments not more highly than we ought to think, we would give a proof of Christian love that would not fail to tell with unerring effect on all our intercourse with our fellow-men. (Applause.) Why, it is the denial of this forbearance that is the cause of that want of Christian love which we all profess to deplore. If we would make it our chief business and aim to live in Christ, and to live for Christ, I believe many of those points which we hold now with so much tenacity, and look upon as vital and sacred, would dwarf into insignificance. Churches that acknowledge the Scriptures to be the Word of God—Churches that look only for salvation by Christ, and profess obedience to Him—Churches holding these and like precious truths, although they may differ on minor points, are bound to seek communion with one another; and if we allow denominational differences or abstract theories to hinder that union to which we are commanded, a heavy responsibility will rest upon us, and the question, “Is Christ divided?” addressed to the Corinthians in the way of reproof, may be taken to ourselves.

In seeking union we are not asked to renounce any one of our principles. Truth is not to be compromised in any way, and it is only a firm adherence to the truth that will make the union lasting and sure. The union sought is a unity of faith—the belief, and profession, and defence of the same truth, and to seek and advance Christ's kingdom on the earth. If, instead of a union such as this, we seek one where men's judgments and opinions are to be made the measure of our agreement, such a course would only lead to endless controversy and division. If we are not content with the union that Christ approves of, it is very certain we will not be satisfied with one of man's devising.

The union sought is big with innumerable blessings to the Church. The strength that is now wasted will become more concentrated; the spirit of rivalry will be quenched; the purity of the Church will be promoted; and we shall be able to present a compact and unbroken front to those hosts of ignorance, superstition, and infidelity that seem drawing together, as if for some mighty conflict. And when the strife with vain philosophy and unbelief thickens around us—when Satan's armies are assailing the truth on every side—are the Churches of Christ in this land, who are bound to defend this truth, alone to remain separate? If we were united, our strength and power would be immeasurably increased; we would be enabled to contend with the enemies of the faith with that concentration of effort which is always the forecast of victory. There never was a time when such a power could be put to so great a purpose. There never was a time when our Churches could less afford to present a scandal to the world. (Loud applause.)

Mr GAULT, Glasgow, reminded the Assembly that the banner was given to the Church to be displayed because of the truth, and not to be pulled down or surrendered. They were to buy the truth and sell it not. If they lowered the principle of the Church Establishment, they would cease to be the historical Church of Scotland. Dr Chalmers gave it as his dying testimony that Voluntaryism had not solved the question of evangelisation, nor had it solved it yet. Neither had Voluntaryism solved

the education question. Mr Gault concluded by saying that if they had to surrender the Establishment principle, they should give up the idea of union altogether.

Mr ADAM, Aberdeen, moved the adjournment of the debate, and the House adjourned at ten minutes before five o'clock.

EVENING SEDERUNT.

The Assembly met at seven o'clock.

Mr ADAM, Aberdeen. (who had moved the adjournment of the debate,) said the decision of the Assembly on this question would do a great deal to determine whether the union would be carried into effect or not—and not only so, but he was persuaded it would determine what position the Free Church would occupy, and what influence it would exert on the community. If this movement should be arrested by the prevalence of certain views, then, he confessed, he looked forward to the future with apprehension, almost with dismay, and, in his view, their prospects would not be bright, but gloomy. There ought, therefore, to be the utmost frankness, especially on the part of the younger ministers of the Church. He thought the small number of such ministers in the union committee had been attended with considerable disadvantages, for some of the complications arose from the old and bitter Voluntary controversy. It was not easy for those who took part in the controversy, who gained their spurs and carried off their laurels then—it was not easy for them to forget that now; and a state of feeling had been produced at that time which to some extent continued till the present hour. Many of the younger members of the House were free from the entanglements of such associations, and he considered that in some points of view this gave them an advantage in discussing the question. Referring to the motions before the House, he observed that three reasons had been urged in support of Dr Begg's proposal—first of all, that, considering the immature state of the question, they should come to no such finding as they were asked to adopt. Now, it was four years since the union committee was appointed, and during that period this part of the question had been most thoroughly discussed—so thoroughly that they themselves stated that there was no reason to believe that the results would be materially different were they to sit down other four years considering the same part of the question. (Applause.) It was rather late in the day, he thought, to speak of the immature state of the question, at least with reference to the part of it now engaging attention. The second reason assigned was the overtures that had been laid on the table of the Assembly. These were not very numerous, and they were remarkably similar. He did not know whether this indicated a common paternity or not—(laughter)—but he found absolutely nothing in them that for a moment should arrest the consideration of this question. Another objection was based on the very constitution of the Assembly itself, as composed of only one-third of the ministers of the Church. Why, if that were a barrier to-night, it would equally be one ten or twenty years hence. (Hear, hear, "No, no," and applause.) It would be one to the end of the chapter. Did Dr Begg mean that this question ought to be sent down to Presbyteries and congregations, and having ascertained their mind, that it should then be discussed in the Assembly? This was not the course taken in any other case, and to adopt it here would be about the most unwise thing that could be

imagined. Of course it was not intended to overlook Presbyteries and congregations, but in the meanwhile it was the duty of the Assembly to state their views, leaving these views to have the influence naturally attending the convictions and feelings of the Assembly. There was nothing at all in these reasons, and he thought there must have been considerable difficulty in making out a case when their friends fell back upon the constitution of the Assembly as a reason why they should not go on to the consideration of the question. But, further, they not only might look—they must look at the question at this moment, for clearly the first head of the programme was the great difficulty of the whole matter, and what would be the use of going on to discuss subordinate points if they had made up their minds—as some had apparently done—that this was an insuperable objection to union. (Cries of “No, no.”) He thought it was clear beyond dispute that their friends had advocated views which showed they had made up their minds upon the subject. (Hear, hear, “No, no,” and applause.) It was delightful to think how harmonious the Churches were in regard to the duty of the civil magistrate generally with respect to religion and the Church, for there was no difference, except with reference to the one point, whether it might be the duty of the civil magistrate to set up an establishment, and endow it from the resources of the State. He saw no way of getting out of this difficulty but one—namely, to make it a matter of forbearance, or what is called an open question. No doubt Dr Begg and others told them that by discussion, and by dealing with their United Presbyterian friends, they might bring them up to higher views upon this great subject; but he was not sure if he would respect them more if they could drive them from the convictions they had hitherto entertained. (Hear, hear, and cries of “Oh, oh.”) He was afraid that if by pressure they were led to renounce their views, he would be rather less ready to enter into a union with them. (Applause.) He denied that to make this an open question was a sacrifice of truth, and he maintained that it was absolutely necessary, unless the Assembly were prepared to have standards embracing every iota of divine truth, and every phase and aspect of divine truth, which, he was afraid, would not conduce to the healthy action of the Christian Church. Even in the primitive Church, under the guidance of apostles, the observance of the Mosaic law was regarded as an open question; and it was a matter of notoriety that, in their own Church, they were not all agreed upon certain questions—such as the time and manner of our Lord’s second coming, and the use of hymns in divine worship. If his friends were to exclude all open questions, they would have another work than that of union before them. (Hear, hear.) He regarded the question of endowments as not a matter of primary importance. They were not likely soon to have such an offer of endowments as they would be able to accept, and why they should allow a theoretical difference to stand in the way, he could not for a moment understand. It was argued that they must let nothing drop out of the testimony of the Church—that they must stand by it in every particular. But he held it was the spiritual independence of the Church—its absolute freedom from all civil control—that was from the outset the essence of the testimony of the Church. When he subscribed the Confession of Faith he did so honestly and sincerely, and while he believed the text of the Confession and all the passages of the Confession, he certainly did not understand that his

subscription implied that he held the perfectly sound and wise interpretation of all the passages presented in it, for it would be a bondage perfectly intolerable were they to be bound to believe that every one of these passages was a conclusive proof and the best that could be selected in favour of the doctrine to which the passages referred. He had now only a word to say in regard to the question of doctrine. He was not a member of this union committee, and therefore could not say whether the account given by Dr Wood was a correct one or not. The one outstanding fact was, that the committee did not go into the adoption of a particular motion made and supported by Dr Wood and Dr Gibson. He was not surprised at that. (A laugh.) Why, observe, when the motion was introduced it was after lengthened investigation and discussion in the committee as regarded the doctrine of the Confession of Faith upon the whole subject. Their friends, representing their own Church, had been at great pains to ascertain whether their United Presbyterian brethren understood the Confession in the same sense as themselves. Well, they had attained to a satisfactory result, and then this step was taken in a way that could scarcely fail to lead their brethren to imagine they were suspected—that an attempt was made to bind them down by a formal deliverance after they had honestly expressed their belief in the whole teachings of the Confession on that point. There were few things more odious for an individual or a Church than to be suspected of heresy, and he thought their friends on the other side of the House should have been more careful before they brought a charge of that description. He felt that it did high credit to the United Presbyterian committee that they had patiently gone into the matter, and given all the satisfaction they possibly could. In closing, he was led to say that his state of mind, when these negotiations commenced, was very much like what Dr Rainy said his was. He was indifferent, if he was not opposed to the movement altogether, but he now saw the need that there was for all possible union and harmony among the followers of the Redeemer. (Applause.) Not to promote such union was, in his opinion, to play into the hands of the enemy and to do his work most effectually. He did not wish any undue haste; he did not wish any hard driving in this matter. (Hear, hear.) He had met, in Edinburgh and elsewhere, some who had the idea that several of their leading friends were designing to carry them by one sweep into the United Church; but he must say that in his dealings with them he had never seen anything to countenance the idea. He trusted they would be patient with one another, and he hoped that when this movement was consummated there would not be so much as a single hoof left behind. (Applause and laughter.) They should, however, guard against undue delay as well as undue haste. (Applause.) The rev. gentleman concluded by hoping that the union would become a realised fact during the lives of those fathers under whose auspices the movement had been commenced. He thought that on the supposition of the union taking place, their light that day would be somewhat shaded and their joy somewhat abated if by any unnecessary delay, they found those gone who presided over the discussions, and who, but for the delay, might have guided the movement to its close. (Applause.)

Mr M'CORKLE, St Ninian's, remarked at the outset that the United Presbyterians did not endorse the views of the union committee in their published articles. He held that, since last Assembly, there was a

greater divergence than ever from the line that pointed towards union. In answer to what Mr Adam had affirmed, he would say that if the mutual-forbearance principle be a good one, let them go through with it. (Hear, hear.) There were decided differences of opinion on the whole question of the civil magistrate's province in religion among the Presbyteries and ministers of the United Presbyterian Church; and if they were to make one part of that question an open one, why not the whole? The mutual-forbearance principle was a very elastic one, and admitted of indefinite application. It was an easy solution of difficulties; it was so accommodating that they could carry it very easily and directly through the whole extent of the programme. They did not even need the aid of an ecclesiastical committee in this matter. They had only to request the presence of an acute lawyer from the Parliament House—they would need such a one—and put into his hands the materials before them, and instruct him to draw up out of these materials a basis on the ground of mutual forbearance, and to tell him to see to it in particular—for that was essential—that the property of the uniting Churches should be secured, and he would present them with as good and safe a basis as any learned and reverend doctor of them all. (Laughter.) So far then as the articles of agreement were concerned, there was no agreement expressed by the returns from the Presbyteries of the United Presbyterian Church. (Hear, hear.) Then let them look to the distinctive differences of the two Churches. These appeared as clearly as ever. To affirm that the difference was a small one was to trifle with the question. To say that the difference was narrowed down to the small point of national endowments of religion was both a defective and deceptive statement. (Hear, hear.) Why, the whole doctrine respecting national establishments of the true religion, and the proper relation of the Church to the State, was involved in the issue. Of this there was ample proof. In the new declaration issued, the union committee of the United Presbyterian Church said it was not competent for the civil magistrate to give legislative sanction to any creed in the way of setting up a civil establishment of religion. The denial of the magistrate's power to endow the Church out of the national revenue was but a corollary from that position. Now, mark the serious consequences included in that proposal. All the alliance of Church and State that distinguished the Reformation history of our Church was called in question—(hear, hear)—all the acts and deeds of the Church during the period when Church and State were allied, and when religion was revived under the influence of both, were declared null and void. This Voluntary dogma was not indeed an "Act Rescissory," affirming them to be seditious and treasonable, but it was a declaration rescissory, which stamped illegality on them all. It overthrew the testimonies, the deeds, and the very aims of our reformers and martyrs—nay, the very design of the Secession itself was reversed, which design contemplated the reformation as well as the union of Church and State, and their return in union to their first principles and early attainments. Not only so, but our very national Protestant creed, our Church and State creed, was weakened by this declaration at the very time that our national Protestantism was imperilled. The State, in alliance with the Church in times past, had been a most powerful bulwark of the Reformation cause. He did not see how, on the Voluntary principle, they were to resist the encroachments of Popery. He had

heard it said, and in this House, that national establishments were doomed. The men who said that might have the first sight, but it was quite possible they might not have the second sight. Events which were coming immediately cast their shadows before, but events more in the future did not always do so. Were they sure that on the ruins of Protestant establishments there might not be erected a Popish establishment? (Cries of "Oh, oh," and laughter.) Is it impossible? It was the Voluntary principle, and nothing else, which had come up again to the surface, exactly as they were familiar with it in days of old. That principle is embodied and embedded in the distinctive declaration of the United Presbyterian union committee which disallows the civil establishment of a national religion. Certainly, as Dr Buchanan said, there was an extreme Voluntaryism thirty or forty years ago, and he found that extreme type of Voluntaryism respectably represented at this present time in the United Presbyterian Church. He was persuaded that that eloquent speech by which so many were carried away in 1863, would prove to be a beautiful dissolving view. The question at issue had come to be, Are we to become Voluntaries in a united Church? The United Presbyterian Church declared—You must come up to our platform; we cannot come down to yours. This was a strange one-sided reciprocity. They did not sacrifice a single principle, but they required this Church to sacrifice principles which they held to be vital. No doubt, they were told they could hold their own individual opinions in the united body. It was not their own testimony or principles that were concerned, but the testimony of the Church, the principles of the Free Church. The late Dr M'Crie, when addressed by a similar argument, said—So far as my individual opinions or principles are concerned, I can hold them in solitude as well as in society. (Hear, hear.) It was also vain and irrelevant to say, as Mr Adam said, that there were individual diversities of opinion in this Church. He asked what had this difference of view to do with the question of upholding those principles of our Church, which were publicly sanctioned and guaranteed, and in which they were all supposed to agree. (Hear, hear.) As for the historical position of the Church, he would express his indebtedness to his good friend from Stirling who spoke at the close of the forenoon sederunt, and who read a paper which delightfully tickled all their fancies, and relieved them from the exercise of their judgments on the question at all. (Laughter and hisses.) The question of the magistrate's position covered the whole ground of the historical position of the Church. Abandon the lawfulness of Church and State, and the whole Reformation testimony of the Church of Scotland was sacrificed. Notwithstanding all this, it was gravely proposed that there should be a united declaration by the united body, not with respect to the attainments of that Church, but simply as to the historical fact that they were all separations from that Church, and protests against defections therefrom. And this was gravely proposed by ignoring the fact that the several Presbyterian unions which had taken place had fallen away from many of the reformed principles of the Church of Scotland, and that this one which was contemplated in our day threatened to be the greatest defection from these principles of all. And this, forsooth, was historical identity. Was the whole drama to be concluded with that farce? He had only one word on the question of doctrine. The extracts laid down before them from the Confession to prove agreement

in doctrine did not touch the question at issue. The allegation, as he understood it, was not that the parties did not profess to hold these doctrines and believe in these extracts, but they professed to believe in these and something more; and *that something more* bearing on the nature and extent of the atonement seriously affected those doctrines of the Confession which were the very ground of agreement. It was a very serious and hazardous thing for a Church to give forth an uncertain sound in doctrine. They had only to look on the influence Baxter's writings had on the British Churches, when those Churches who held his doctrines went down at last into Arianism and Socinianism. They were charged with not seeking the peace of Jerusalem; but were they to seek that peace by setting Jerusalem in an uproar. (Laughter and applause.) It had been said that a great responsibility rested on those who arrested this movement at the present stage. Let the responsibility rest where it ought—on those rowers who had rowed them into deep waters, and were now threatening to cast them among the breakers. And if, after an existence of a quarter of a century, the Free Church should cease to be, let them mark well the parties and the policy that should have led onward to the issue. (Applause.)

The MODERATOR—Before proceeding further, I think it right to say that in the interest of free discussion in this question, as so many members are evidently anxious to speak, those who address the House should confine their remarks within the narrowest possible limits. (Hear, hear.)

Dr GRIERSON said he had all along taken the deepest interest in the question, though he had known nothing of the negotiations in the committee, otherwise than as the results appeared in print. A union between the non-Established Presbyterian bodies in Scotland is a subject of the deepest interest to all who love the Church from which we are descended. The idea of being at last reunited in the bosom, as it were, of the parent, is an idea very sweet to entertain. He had sometimes entertained the hope that their United Presbyterian brethren might see eye to eye with them, and unite in the entire recognition of those principles which their forefathers held when they seceded from the Church of Scotland. (Hear, hear.) He could not, however, entertain that hope any longer. It had been made abundantly manifest that the principle which they had now adopted and acted upon for many years was a principle that it was in vain to attempt to dislodge from their minds. (Hear, hear, and applause.) But it was pleasant to find in the articles of agreement that there was, on the part of the United Presbyterian brethren, a distinct recognition of the Supreme Headship of the Lord Jesus Christ, not only over the Church, but over the nations. There was, however, this difference between the two Churches. While the Free Church held that it was the duty of the civil magistrate, under particular circumstances, to give support to the Church of Christ out of the national resources, their United Presbyterian friends declare, on the contrary, that as Christ has provided for the maintenance of His public services by the liberality of the members of the Church, that *excludes* all other modes and means of support. He did not himself see the logical connexion between that conclusion and the premises to which he had referred. He did not think that, because it was, in certain circumstances, the duty of Christians to provide for the maintenance of religious ordinances, therefore they were excluded from

accepting assistance from any other quarter, when the acceptance of such assistance would not involve any compromise of spiritual independence. If he was not mistaken, there had been in the history of the United Presbyterian Church some instances in which they had not declined assistance from without their own body. But it was undeniable that there was a material distinction between them. They decidedly object to anything like the national recognition of the Church, though they expect the civil magistrate to do all in his power, and in his official capacity, consistently with the gospel to promote its progress and interests. Still, he observed in the proceedings that took place in the United Presbyterian Synod on the subject of instrumental music that one of the most prominent speakers insisted that it could not be *sinful* to use instrumental music in churches, because it had been in use in the Church under the Mosaic dispensation. Well, he would just turn round and say that he found, under the Mosaic dispensation, that there was a national recognition of religion. (Applause.) Do we not know that for 2500 years God had no national establishment of religion, then communicating personally with the patriarchs—one of whom He chose and called to be the father of a great nation, to which he communicated the ordinances of his worship. We have here plain evidence that, under certain circumstances, a national system of religion is not necessary, while under other circumstances such a system may, with divine authority, be introduced and maintained. Then we find that when the gospel was first preached, instead of being established, it was everywhere spoken against, and its preachers persecuted. And when the powers of the world began to look favourably on the gospel, the establishment which they were disposed to promote was one on which the liberty of the Church was compromised. We do not plead for an establishment in circumstances in which the spiritual independence of the Church would be compromised. And it appears that establishment or non-establishment must depend upon the circumstances in which the Church is placed. (Hear, hear.) We may be in circumstances just now where there is no prospect of an establishment on satisfactory principles, but all we insist upon is, that meantime it shall be an open question whether or not the magistrate shall recognise religion by an establishment or not. But this is making an open question only of that which God's own example authorises to be thus regarded. By asking a union, on this ground, the Free Church does not compromise the personal convictions of her members. They carry their liberty into the union, and if circumstances should ever arise in which this state of things should be introduced, it will be as competent as ever for the members of the Free Church, or those who think with them in the United Church, to renew their application for this scriptural support to religion by the resources of the nation. If the union were to take place, even then they should have the principles of the Disruption carried with them just as truly as they carried them with them to Tanfield Hall. (Applause.) Nor would they finally decide this matter before taking the opinions of Presbyteries and congregations; but they were not going to ask the opinions of Presbyteries and congregations before expressing their own. (Hear, and cheers.) By their decision they were only expressing the prevailing convictions in that great General Assembly on this subject. They were not forestalling or superseding the decisions of Presbyteries and congrega-

tions; they were only letting them see how they would direct them. And he hoped the union would not take place until it takes place in such circumstances as that we shall not leave a single member of our beloved Free Church behind. (Cheers.)

At this point Mr Burnside, Falkland; Mr Waters, Burghead; Dr M'Gilvray, and one or two other members rose simultaneously, and a good deal of merriment ensued before it could be decided which of the two first-named gentlemen was in possession of the House. At last the floor was given up to

Mr BURNSIDE, who maintained that the articles of agreement had a most fatal flaw in them—what would make it impossible for them to lead to a satisfactory conclusion. There were two middle terms in the syllogism, and where such is the case, or where one middle term is used in a double sense, there can be no satisfactory conclusion. With respect to the magistrate, he can never act as a magistrate unless he use force, for he is not to bear the sword in vain, but to be a terror to evil-doers. In the case of Sabbath-breaking, he must interfere by force to put it down; in the case of the marriage affinity question, if a marriage takes place within the forbidden degrees—(laughter)—then the offspring of such marriage is illegitimate. (Much laughter.) So with respect to issuing of royal proclamations of Fast-days, and thanksgiving days, and with respect to assessments for the support of the poor, the magistrate must interfere, by force, to secure the carrying out of his decrees. Mr Burnside went on to insist that it is the duty of Government to care for the lapsed masses, as well as pay enormous sums for the salaries of police officers, for prisoners, and that offenders should be brought up and hanged. (Laughter.) When they thought of these things, it was no wonder that the union committee should not be agreed among themselves. Notoriously, certain members were dissatisfied—Dr Forbes, Dr Gibson, and Dr Wood, and, on a recent occasion, out of 14 who voted, 7 were not satisfied. Therefore, it was very important to do what Dr Begg proposed—send the whole matter back to the union committee, to allow them to come to some proper understanding on the subject. The differences were great, and he should decidedly object that the doctrine of Christ's Headship over the nations should be made the shadow of a shade, and to propose that it be made an open question was not a satisfactory state of things. Mr Burnside went on to speak of the friendly testimony given by the Irish Presbyterian Church to the Free Church at the period of the Disruption when they sought aid from the Free Church in the Canonmills Hall, and acknowledged it, and not the Establishment, to be the true Church of Scotland, and he deprecated the risk of the Free Church being constrained by this union movement to turn the cold shoulder to her Irish Presbyterian brethren, who were as faithful to their principles now as ever they were, and who had not the least hankering after organs, and among whom there were no controversies as to the extent of the atonement. In conclusion, Mr Burnside suggested that it was high time for the Assembly to give instructions to those who were sent at the expense of this Church as a deputation to other Churches, that they should not attempt to cast ridicule on ministers belonging to the very Church whose deputies they were, by comparing them, as a rev. doctor recently has done, to players on the bassoon and bass drum. Possibly the rev. doctor in question had

no time to prepare his speech. At all events he betrayed ignorance as to music, in supposing that *bass* in music had any connexion with *base* in the sense of being contemptible. Music had a foundation, viz. *bass*, and in the same way *union* must have a foundation, viz. *purity*. "The wisdom that is from above is first pure, then peaceable, gentle, and easy to be entreated, full of mercy and good fruits, without partiality, and without hypocrisy."

Great impatience at this time prevailed.

Dr GIBSON—I rise to say that if a member of this House, in so important a matter as this, is not to get a fair hearing, that will not promote Christian union. The members of this House must be heard, and must not be put down. Here are gentlemen coming to complain that only members of the committee are heard; and then, when parties not accustomed attempt to address this House they are ruffed down by mere noise. (Hear and laughter.)

Mr JAMES BALFOUR, elder—One word on the point of order. I quite agree with Dr Gibson that every member is entitled to a fair hearing in this House. But every member cannot get a fair hearing in this House if some members unduly occupy the time of the House. I think our excellent friend Mr Burnside—

A MEMBER on the right of the chair—It is impossible to hear a word said here.

Mr BALFOUR—I put it to our friend Mr Burnside whether it is not a little unreasonable, when so many gentlemen are in a similar position with himself, that he should occupy so large a portion of the time of the House.

Mr BURNSIDE—The wisdom that cometh from above is first pure, then peaceable. (Much laughter, during which Mr Burnside resumed his seat.)

Mr WATERS, Burghead—With regard to this union question—the few words he had to say would principally be to the worthy leaders of our Church—he would take the liberty of reminding them that at the period of the Disruption, we and our congregations did most willingly and cheerfully follow them—not merely because we knew them to be men of great talent, and that had its influence, not because they were men of profound and extensive learning—of considerable eloquence and of undaunted piety,—all these had their influence—but we followed them because they were contending earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints—contending for the Christian privileges and rights of the Presbyterian people of Scotland, to choose their own pastors, and to prevent the intrusion of unsuitable ministers on reclaiming congregations.

We followed them then because we knew whither they were leading us; but did they suppose that we would follow them in this new direction, when we scarcely knew where they were to stop, or what our position would eventually be? They seemed to think that they might take any course they chose, and wave their hand to us to follow. That course of procedure will not do, we knew where we stood, as stanch Free Church people it will not be easy to move us. We are well pleased with the principles of our Church. God could not have been better to any Church; He had greatly blessed her ministers and people in things temporal and spiritual. For these advantages we ought to be thankful and not tempt God, for the sake of ministers, to join Churches whose principles were not in many important points the same.

Our worthy leaders are now running too far and too fast without apprising us of what has been done or what is still doing in these committee negotiations, regarding this intended union. You must not surely think of choosing any bargain with these churches without making known to us what the terms are, neither we as ministers, office-bearers, or congregations, will follow you in the dark. Or should some ministers do so, will their congregations follow, as they did at the Disruption, and what is the good of pastors without flocks?

Remember, we did not come as Voluntaries, nor are we in theory so to this day, we are in that respect the same as we were in 1843. If we were in heart and mind Voluntaries, we had no occasion to wait till the Disruption, we had it in our power to have joined these much-respected Presbyterian Churches before as after that memorable period.

There are many points on which we widely differ—points which do not appear to have been half settled by the joint-committee. This we learn from what we have read and heard to-day from the programme. Little progress appears to have been made in that joint-committee. The matter seems to stand much the same as it did four years ago. I have no doubt our highly-respected Free Church committee did all they could in these many meetings to effect an agreement, but they have failed as to the civil magistrate. The other Churches have made no concession at all.

The members of our committee have told us again and again to-day, that they admire the consistency and firmness with which these other Churches adhere to their principles. How is it, then, that you do not put it in their power to pay you the same compliment? How low must you sink in their estimation when you so easily make so many concessions, especially regarding the lawfulness of an Established Church—on Christian terms—for which you so faithfully fought against them during the Voluntary controversy.

But, Moderator, I perceive that my voice is not so strong as it once was, and that I am not heard by the noise, therefore I must close before finishing what I intended further to say. One word only before sitting down. Our Voluntary friends still hold that the gospel must be supported at home, and propagated through the world exclusively by free-will offerings, and if supported less or more by state pecuniary aid, would be sinful. Therefore they resist the annuity-tax in Edinburgh. Moderator, and Christian friends, you have all heard of this annuity-tax. Our country friends, especially the farmers, when the reform bill shall pass, and this union of these Churches be consummated, some paying £50, £100, £150 of rent, will probably, when settling with a factor, say, We are now Voluntaries, we will retain in our own hands the portion of the rent which pays the minister's stipend, and the parochial schoolmaster's salary. They may say you may distrain for that part—they may not inquire to whom the teinds legally belong.

Sir HENRY MONCREIFF then said—I think in one sense it may appear that there is truth in what has been said about progress by Mr Waters. There is one sense in which it may fairly be said that there has not much progress been made in this question, because at the very beginning a great number of us saw that the question probably would just be this—Can we allow the known differences between us and the United Presbyterian Church to be treated in such a way as would enable us to unite?

Before we can judge of the question, we need to make careful inquiry about it. You have the result of the inquiry. I don't believe you can get further on in ascertaining what the difference amounts to than you have actually got, and therefore we unquestionably are just at the same point now as that at which we started, only with the benefit of the information which makes us sure of what the difference is. We are called upon now to look in the face the position of things at the time this committee was appointed, and to say whether the result of the inquiry is to prove what many imagined at the time, that the difference now about this first head of the programme may be stated to be such as need not be a bar to union. Now, let us look at what the main question really is as between the two motions. The main question refers to two points. First of all, with regard to the main question, I say you have to consider—Is there any good reason why, in existing circumstances, for the interests of this Church and the cause of Christ, you should not say that upon the first head of the programme there is no bar to union, viewed in itself? (Applause.) That is one question. The other question is, Is there any good reason to make us feel that an obligation lies upon us to say, if we can, whether under this first head of the programme there be a bar to union or not? That is the state of the question. I have great consideration for the views of persons who may not have looked at all the parts of this question as closely as some others have done, when they feel, in the first instance, some doubt as to what kind of answer should be given to either of the queries I have now been suggesting. Let us look at this subject as it has been discussed to-night in that point of view. There is one reason that seems to weigh with some people. They think that by agreeing to Dr Candlish's motion you are hurrying on the union itself beyond the possibility of recall—that you are hurrying it on so that there will be no right opportunity for a fair judgment of the whole matter by the Church. Now, of course, there may be a little difficulty in some people's mind about that. Some people may have the conception, as it has been expressed to-night, that somehow or other, if you agree to this resolution about there being no bar to union under the first head of the programme, you will not be able to give attention to the important questions that remain under the other heads of the programme. But this is a view of the matter I utterly deprecate, and it is of great consequence that those who are in favour of Dr Candlish's motion should, in the strongest manner, state that if we thought that by agreeing to the motion we are doing anything that will have a tendency to slur over other questions, we should not agree to it. (Applause.) A good deal of argument has been expended upon points connected with these other questions—the subject of worship, for example, and the question of instrumental music and hymns, and questions as to the Sustentation Fund, and other points, have been alluded to. Now, I will not yield to any one in the strong feeling that I have that that question of the right adjustment of all that concerns the Sustentation Fund, and the support of the ministry, should be looked at very closely and very carefully before the union can be allowed to take place. (Hear, and applause.) I feel that we must not sacrifice anything that we feel as a Church to be essential to the continuance of the position which we have occupied by means of that Sustentation Fund, and I feel that the subject is one that requires the undivided attention of all who are thinking about this union, before it

can be rightly adjusted. Notwithstanding the ideas which some people have, that the effect of agreeing to Dr Candlish's motion will be to prevent these questions being rightly considered, I have the strongest persuasion, from what I have seen from the discussions in the union committee, that the best way, if not the only way, to have every consideration given to the claims of the Sustentation Fund, and that which is essential in it, by our United Presbyterian brethren, and by all parties, is that we shall be enabled, first of all, to see what the effect or result of the inquiries about the first head of the programme is. It is needful we should have our minds cleared up upon that subject before we can look rightly and thoroughly at the others. (Hear, hear.) I feel we may never need to look at any question on the subject of the Sustentation Fund, if we are compelled to say there is a bar to union under the first head of the programme, or under the second, but I feel, on the other hand, that if we are able to say there is no bar to union, so far as we can see, under the first and second heads of the programme, viewed by themselves, and apart from all other questions, then I am persuaded we shall get the other parties to these negotiations to consider them more calmly, and to enter into the ideas we may suggest to them in a better manner. I may as well say something here about the second head of the programme. The deliverance of Dr Candlish's motion does not, in my view of it, preclude the committee from looking at the second head of the programme again, in the same way that it may seem to some to preclude us from looking at the first head. In one view it implies that the first head of the programme, so far as viewed in itself, being disposed of, and having come to the best result we can in our inquiries about it, we are to pass on from it to the other heads. The same thing is not said as to the second head. We have, however, expressed an opinion that there is substantial harmony on the second head of the programme. That is expressed in the motion, and therefore those who support it are undoubtedly willing to maintain that there is that substantial harmony. But it should be borne in mind that Dr Wood, to-day, says he has at other times, and elsewhere, maintained that there is no such substantial harmony under the second head of the programme. (Cries of "Entire.") Well, I do not care what the word is—(a laugh)—no such entire harmony as is represented in the report and deliverance of the committee. Now, for my part, I do not wish to dwell on this portion of the subject at present. I think it would be more fitting to leave that in the hands of Dr Rainy, who shall reply as the proposer of the motion, but, at the same time, I must advert to what was stated by Dr Wood. He spoke in regard to this solemn subject about the danger of "paltering in a double sense." He spoke as if the meaning of the committee must be that we were endeavouring to make out that two things were the same which were not. But, really that is not what I understand to be anything like the case. I think nobody believes that the statement made by these United Presbyterian brethren about Christ having satisfied justice for all men—nobody maintains that that is the same statement with the other one which Dr Wood referred to; but what is maintained is, that when you thoroughly examine into what they mean by that assertion, you discover that after all they do not mean what some of you might think at first sight it was fitted to convey; but they mean something else, which, as Dr Rainy has already pointed out, cannot be held to be at

variance with the Confession of Faith. Observe, the idea suggested by the two statements to my mind would be in the first instance—Did these friends mean to qualify in any measure the doctrine that Christ died as the substitute for His people, that He died actually as a substitute in their room, and that, in the eternal counsel of God the Father, this substitution was designed for His own chosen people. Now, it was most solemnly declared by these brethren, and by those who spoke most decidedly, that they hold the doctrine of the substitution as strongly and as fully as we do. (Hear, hear, and applause.) They declared that they held as strongly as we the doctrine of Christ being a substitute according to the eternal counsel of God for a chosen people. And when they spoke of Christ satisfying divine justice for all men, I understood them to mean nothing contrary to this, but simply that the atonement was designed in the eternal counsel of God to be sufficient for all men, so that a free offer might be made to all on the ground of it. I understood them to mean that such passages as “God so loved the world,” &c., must be interpreted in as free a sense as if there were no eternal election, and that no attempt should be made to reconcile these things by the theories or logic of man. I shall say no more on that point, but I would advert here to some things said by Dr Begg. He made a threefold classification of persons, according to the views which he supposed them to be influenced by on the subject of union. I do not see that this classification has the least degree of relevancy in our present discussion. It is just a specimen of a mode of argument or suggestion in a question of this kind, which may produce an effect, but which possesses no manner of substance in it. Dr Begg speaks of those who object to union altogether. What have we to do with them in this discussion? He speaks also of a few persons who are ready for union at any price. What have we to do with them in this discussion? The allusion to them is fitted to suggest some of those unreasonable insinuations, which by dint of mere repetition, without one particle of proof, have obtained a lodgment in the minds of some people. Dr Begg refers to those who wish for union, but only provided it can be established consistently with the maintenance of principle. Now, I maintain that there is no reason whatever for supposing that any of us take any view different from this one. I say we are endeavouring, by means of Dr Candlish’s motion, to carry out union in harmony with right principles, in harmony with the principles of the Word of God, in harmony with the principles of this Church. If it be thought that there is a principle here connected with our Church’s testimony that cannot be compromised, if it be thought that there is a compromise of the distinctive principles of the United Presbyterian Church in the articles of agreement as now set before us—if it be thought there is a principle connected with our testimony that is plainly violated by an endeavour to come to union in this state of the question, then I say it is the duty of those who think it to say it not only in their speeches but in their motions, and to say that we cannot go further. (Hear, hear, and applause.) I cannot comprehend those ideas that lead men to say that they will go into a motion like Dr Begg’s, when the whole argument in favour of the motion, almost from beginning to end, has been an argument that implies, upon the face of the document before us, that there is a bar to union. (Applause.) I say if the motion does not say so, it is time it should say so. (Renewed applause.) Let us observe, Moderator, that, in the view

of the United Presbyterian Church, the existence of a difference of opinion which cannot be compromised or explained away is manifest. They do not see any prospect of ever coming nearer to one another about this difference than we have already come. But, then, Dr Wood tells us that we do not know that we have already come even to the state of agreement in which we might seem to be. He has brought forward an argument to prove that the declaration of the United Presbyterian Church, the other day, carried by such an overwhelming majority—(hear, hear)—with a minority just enough to show what the real meaning of the declaration is—(a laugh)—Dr Wood tells us that it does not mean what it seems to mean, and that our friends in the Synod have been paltering in a double sense. When Dr Cairns made a motion expressing satisfaction with the progress made and the amount of harmony prevailing, in all honesty and fairness they are to be understood as saying that they are well pleased with the articles, in so far as they show an amount of harmony, in so far as they imply agreement on the part of the several bodies in the committee. But Dr Wood said that the meaning of the United Presbyterian Synod was, that the whole matters of difference were to be made matters of forbearance. So far, of course, as there remains any difference, it was to be a matter of forbearance. The question is, What does there remain of difference, does there remain anything of difference that is not expressed by means of the articles? They virtually tell us that we need not go into committee again with them, if we do so under the influence of the imagination, that we may thereby induce them to abandon their Voluntaryism, such as it now appears to be in their distinctive articles. They do not expect to persuade us that our opinions in favour of the establishment principle are erroneous. Under the guidance, as I conceive, both of common sense and Christian consideration, they virtually ask us to tell them whether the ascertained difference between us be sufficient or not to prevent our union. If you think that it is sufficient to prevent our union, then you are trifling with the real character of the question at its present stage when you propose to go into a motion for the re-appointment of the committee. In making that proposal, do you wish the joint-committee to resume consideration of the first head of the programme? I do not ask whether you wish that head to be looked at again in connexion with the results which may be arrived at as to the remaining heads. I take for granted that we all admit the propriety, and even the necessity, of estimating the effect of the difference about the first head of the programme, when viewed alongside of any differences which may arise under the other heads. But do you wish, I ask, that our conferences about the first head of the programme, looked at by itself, should be resumed, so as to open up again the articles of agreement? Do you mean that we may still hope to find out that our agreement is actually greater than those articles show? Then you ought to say so, to prevent misunderstanding. If you were to say so, I could not concur with you; for I feel assured that we have now gone as far as it is reasonably possible to do in making it clear that we are agreed as to all that is vital in what the Word of God indicates on the subject of the civil magistrate in his relation to religion and the Church. But this is not what those appear to mean who support the second motion now before the House. And therefore, I ask further, Do you mean that you hope to convert our friends of the United Presbyte-

rian Church to your own views in favour of the Establishment principle? Are you going to try to drive them out of their Voluntaryism altogether? Whatever you may intend, you may rest assured that to re-appoint the committee without saying that there is no bar to union under the first head of the programme, viewed by itself, you will be understood, and fairly understood, to be aiming at that kind of dealing with our United Presbyterian brethren which my excellent friend, Dr Rainy, has characterised as involving an endeavour to school them into your views in a manner they cannot be expected to submit to. It is very plain Dr Begg means something of that kind. He says when the United Presbyterians insist upon the condition of the negotiations being carried on, that we are to say there is no bar to union, it means that we are to abandon our principles. It is very easy to use vague and general language in that way, and talk of abandoning principles and maintaining our testimony, and so on; but if Dr Begg were always to translate these assertions into what they must necessarily be resolved into when you look closely at the question, I don't think they would have the same effect, because what it really means is, that we are not to insist upon making these points terms of communion. The real question is, whether you are prepared to insist upon what Dr Begg maintains to be part of your testimony, the Establishment principle, as a term of communion. We are told that our United Presbyterian friends will give up nothing, and that they are asking us to give up everything. But observe that Dr Begg asks them to abandon their personal opinions which they conscientiously hold. Do they ask us to do that? They do not ask us to abandon an opinion which we hold. They are willing that we should continue to hold as strongly as we like all our views in favour of the Establishment principle; but what you are insisting upon is, that they shall abandon their personal opinions on the Establishment principle before you will allow them to unite with you. We often testify for a great many things that are never made terms of communion. There are some things we think it right to testify always about, and even some of these we do not make terms of communion—(hear, hear)—and it does not follow that everything we hold and testify about should necessarily be made a term of communion. It appears to me it would only be reasonable that all those who support Dr Begg's motion should consider very carefully what they are to do under the first head of the programme. (Hear, hear.) There are other reasons brought forward to show that it is very objectionable for us to give this declaration at present. We are asked to support Dr Begg's motion, because this Assembly contains only one-third of our ministers, or because the people have not yet been consulted. Even if this objection were well-founded, it would still be equally reasonable, to say the least, that we should instruct the committee to abstain from any further conference about that first head, until the mind of the whole Church and the whole people could be ascertained as to the effect of the articles of agreement. Whether such a course would be reasonable or not I shall not say, but it would at least be free from all misunderstanding, and would be a fair method of dealing with our United Presbyterian brethren. That would be a right course if the objection were a good one; but I do not think that it is the right course at all. If we cannot, as an Assembly, express our opinion on an important point like the present, because the ministers here only form one-third

part of the Church, then I ask what is the use of our being here at all?—(loud cries of “hear, hear”)—what is the use of our appointing a committee, and what is the use of our being here to receive the report? What is the meaning of the representative principle in our General Assembly? Not certainly that we are to tyrannise over the Church. There is plenty of security against that. But can it be denied that we are here to guide the Church? And what is the principle of the Barrier Act? Is it not to reconcile the free expression of opinion by the General Assembly with the expression of opinion on the part of the Church? Is it not the right way to form an opinion first, and then send it to the Presbyteries to say if they agree to it? We do not come to a final conclusion till it comes back. That is not merely the technical form, but it expresses the spirit of our constitution. How can we send down a question to Presbyteries unless we tell them what we think of it ourselves? It is not our part to command or dictate, but it is our business—the business laid upon us by the Head of the Church, according to our views of Presbyterianism—to help them towards a scriptural view and a reasonable line of action. To adopt the second motion appears to me to discredit our Presbyterian constitution altogether. No doubt, it was said that the Assembly might come to the conclusion to have perpetual moderators. That would be very unconstitutional, but if a majority of this Assembly did not think it unconstitutional, they could come to that agreement if they liked, and send it down to the Presbyteries to decide. If they came to an unconstitutional resolution, the Church would judge of that when sent down; but, however unconstitutional, the proper order for the Assembly was to express its own opinion first. Then something was said about what took place in America about its being settled that no union should take place till three-fourths of the Presbyteries approved. I would go further than that. I do not want any union till a much larger proportion than that is agreed. (Applause.) But that is all proceeding on the delusion that the first motion, which simply gives an opinion on the case as it stands before us just now, with reference to this head of the programme taken by itself, is carrying you the whole way into the union. That is a kind of delusion indeed that may be fostered by some of the eloquence we have heard to-night; but nobody can put it on any sound foundation, it is merely thrown across this House to carry it away. (Applause.) A great deal has been said about hurrying on this union, but what is the real meaning of all that cry about hurry? The objection is not really against hurrying; the real objection is to our being willing to entertain the idea of this being a matter of forbearance. There has been no hurry—nothing of the kind; but some of us think this might be a matter of forbearance, and thinking that we think it right to say so. (Applause.) This Assembly cannot decide the question for the Church, but it may give its opinion. The Assembly giving an opinion will, of course, be of value; and I agree even that it will be important in the history of the Church; but I deny that, if in this Church there be these views at all prevailing which are represented by our friends who supported the other motion, our giving this opinion will in the least degree prevent parties who hold these views giving to them all the effect they can. But we, having that opinion, is it fair to any party that we should be silent? It is unjust to ourselves, and unjust and ungenerous to others; and it is still more unjust, if this

Assembly itself thinks there is a bar to union in the documents now laid on your table, and you do not say so. In connexion with this question of principle that is said to stand so much in the way, it is said that through the ten years' conflict the Establishment principle was maintained as strongly as the duty of the State to recognise the true religion. It is true that, following the light given to our fathers, exhibited as we thought in the Confession of Faith, we believed that an established and endowed condition of the Church was a legitimate application of the principle set forth in the Confession of Faith. The ten years' conflict assumed the truth of this view rather than contended for it. We contended for it in the Voluntary controversy; it was assumed in the ten years' conflict. There was no question between us and the parties then opposed to us in this matter. But then I have to look a little into the question with regard to the principles which must be made terms of communion in a Church. It is admitted that the Establishment principle was always a principle of the Church; but the question might always have been raised, whether it was a term of communion? There was a principle of the ten years' conflict which was made a term of communion, and that was Erastianism. And when I am speaking of the formula, I may just say, that no one ever maintained there was any change made on it with the design of putting out the question of Establishments; but the clause of the formula founded on was framed for the purpose of bringing in the point about the independence of the Church, and making that a term of ministerial communion. It was seen you must refer to the claim of right and protest, and yet it was seen there were a great many things in that claim and protest to which you could not pledge your future ministers, because it involved a great amount of constitutional knowledge they could not be expected to possess. Our ministers, therefore, are not bound by the formula to hold the principle of an Establishment, except in so far as the Confession of Faith might be supposed to bind them. My opinion is, that the Confession binds us to great principles, but does not necessarily involve all the applications of them. I am inclined to speak rather strongly about what Dr Begg spoke of as to the theory on which we would now proceed being an infidel theory. Really he carried his eloquence to an amazing point when he came to say that, because we say there are things sanctioned by the Word of God which we do not make a term of communion, we are giving in to an infidel theory. Dr Begg thinks if we think a thing to be sin, we are bound to shut out all who cannot purge themselves from it, before we admit them to communion. Now, I believe there are ministers of our own Church who conscientiously believe that, according to the Scriptures, it would be sin in them to eat things strangled or flesh prepared with the blood; and if they were to become a majority in our Church, would they ever dream of making that a term of communion? They would think it sin in themselves, but they would not force their view upon us. It is a principle which will not hold water—this principle of insisting that whatever you count sin must be a term of communion. The only thing which has any force in what is said is, there is a thing the Church has testified for three hundred years; will you give it up? And, after all, that comes to be a matter of sentiment and feeling; for unless you can show that the Word of God warrants you to insist on it as a term of communion, then, however much your feelings may incline you to do it, I hold that

we are not warranted to impose it as a term of communion. But I have no difficulty in saying we shall be able to bear our testimony in substance as well in the United Church as we have any reason to expect we could do otherwise, as regards all that is future and all that is essential. There is just one thing I would like to notice. Reference has been made to the open question in regard to the Irish Church, and our intercourse with them, and also to Dr Cairns's statement in the United Presbyterian Synod. I think those who referred to that statement forgot what took place before he made it; because the question was put whether, in sending that deputation, there was to be any approbation of the position they occupied. Dr Cairns was necessarily led to say that he would dissent from the sending of a deputation in such a way as would imply an approval of the position in which that Church stands. I know perfectly well from others of the United Presbyterian Committee, as well as Dr Cairns, that they are not prepared to object to you sending a deputation, but they of course are prepared to protect themselves against being supposed to approve of the position the Irish Church occupies by receiving the *Regium Donum*. That of course is clear. In conclusion, Moderator, allow me to say that the strongest feeling I have at this peculiar juncture arises from my conviction that the proposed union cannot possibly be hurried on to a rapid conclusion. If you agree to Dr Candlish's motion, you may nevertheless reckon upon a very considerable delay before a union can be carried out, and I would deprecate any step that implies the putting of an unnecessary arrest upon our progress. I hold that it will be a very fearful and ominous thing if this Church put a kind of arrest, such as Dr Begg's motion will put, upon the question. If we now know the extent of the difference about the civil magistrate, then the proper time has come for saying we think that difference should prevent our union or that it should not. That you allow that time to pass, and do not indicate your mind, appears to me, not only unjust and ungenerous towards our United Presbyterian brethren and injurious to our character for candour and sagacity, but also destructive to the whole movement. On the whole, a motion that declares that the difference is such as to form a bar to union would not do more harm than the carrying of a motion of this kind, which, as everybody who speaks in favour of it shows, indicates there is a bar, but refuses to tell our brethren that such is the case. (Loud applause.)

Mr NIXON, Montrose, said it appeared to him that it was not desirable to insert in any motion the clause that was in Dr Candlish's motion, towards the end of it. He would just say that from the very first he had had but one feeling on the subject. He was not liable to any of the charges that had been insinuated by some of those who had supported Dr Candlish's motion. He had never done anything, he had never said anything, and he had never felt anything that subjected him to such charges as were implied in the remarks of those who supported Dr Candlish's motion. His hope had been that Dr Begg's motion would have been sufficient; but an impression had got abroad in the minds of many that that motion meant more than it said—that a barrier was intended to be thrown by it in the way of the negotiations. It appeared to him to be necessary—it was their duty so far—that they should have a motion submitted that would leave no cause for such mistaken views being entertained on the subject. When the proposal for union was first submitted, he remembered that this Church had been raised up in the providence of

God, as a Free Church, to occupy a position in this land and in the earth, entirely different from and opposed to the position which they had previously occupied. He was sure that those brethren who lived before the Disruption must feel with him how entirely they were then led in a way they looked not for. They found themselves separating themselves from the State, and forming a Church which has ever since so wonderfully succeeded in maintaining itself and spreading the gospel at home and abroad by the Christian liberality of the people. Moreover, before the Disruption—when they were in the heat of the Voluntary controversy, in which he (Mr Nixon) for one took a very earnest though a humble part, while he, and such as he, had nothing to say against these Christian men themselves—though they spoke strongly against their supposed system, which was now exploded—it was often avowed as a matter of strong conviction that, if they and their opponents could but come into close brotherly conference, in all probability they could come a great deal nearer together on many, if not most, essential points. (Applause.) That was what he had said from the first; and when this proposal for union was made, he (Mr Nixon) said that it was what he had looked for, for nearly a life time, and his confident expectation was, that they would be found to agree on a great many topics anent which they had such controversies. And what had happened? Surely it was admitted that they had come a great deal nearer to their brethren than many had ever expected them to come. (Applause.) It was never our wish to ignore their place and services in the land. We never held that religion depended absolutely on State aid. We never wished one section of the Church to be supported at the expense of the self-supporting sections of it. We repudiate the indiscriminate endowing of all religionists, true and false. We do not approve of endowments when they reproach those who ought to be united. We do not imagine that the endowments will be offered on any conditions indispensable to their acceptance. We have more dependence on Christian liberality than at one time we had. We do not think there is the same need for them as in the time of Knox. We are prepared to join with them in practically looking to Christian liberality for maintaining the regular parts of the Church. (Applause.) And our brethren have in their sentiments also approached nearer to us. They have so far admitted that government aid may in certain circumstances be taken to provide and uphold religious instruction in mission schools abroad, and common schools at home, and through the ministry that is found in the army and at military stations, &c. The question now came to be, and it was here he set himself against the doctrines laid down by Sir H. Moncreiff and others on the other side—Had the Free Church exhausted its conferences with its brethren on the question of their agreements?—had they at last arrived at the utmost limit at which they could expect to arrive in these matters? He was prepared to say they had not. In the first place, it was only within a few hours of the last meeting the committee held that the United Presbyterian brethren presented their distinctive article in its present form. In the forenoon of the Tuesday on which they last met about union, there was a statement to the effect that it was incompetent to the magistrate to give legislative sanction to a creed, which would have been a bar to union; while in the evening of the same day this was so entirely limited—so utterly contracted and limited in its meaning—by the addition of the phrase, “in the way of a civil establishment of religion,”

that, as regards that point, the change made the statement, in his mind, a bar to union no longer. This was a proof that down to the last moment we were uncertain as to the amount of agreement; but beyond that there were other things in which we have yet some questions to solve. There was education, for instance. No doubt it was called the sixth head of the programme, but the article had been practically viewed as part of the first head of the programme. They had never had any discussion on that subject, which was an essential and important part of the duty of the civil magistrate to religion and the Church. No doubt, in answer to certain questions—with regard, for instance, to grants from Government to our mission schools abroad—it was held that it would be allowed in the United Church, provided they were open for secular teaching alone to those who wanted secular instruction alone. He took it upon him to say that it was impossible to view that part of the question as settled. If that condition was the only condition on which they were to have mission schools, their doom was sealed. (Hear, and applause.) If the missionaries were to open their schools for the heathen who wanted secular instruction alone, he believed the doom of those schools was sealed, and they might bid farewell to them. He believed the heathen would very soon knock the whole of them on the head. (A laugh, and “Hear, hear.”) Were they to be as free as a United Church as they now are to Christ’s work? (Applause.) This was the question. Or were they, on the other hand, to have themselves instead, by this union, cramped and fettered? (Hear, hear.) He expected that if they became, on proper conditions, and in a proper spirit, a United Church, they would have a power for good in the earth such as was never known before, but, in order to get to that state, they must take care that their hands were left free to do the work of the Saviour, and not have their hands and feet manacled. He was bound to say that some of the members of our own committee had tried hard to prevent them asking these questions. (Hear, hear, and applause.) They said it would be a matter of indelicacy to do so, for it was pressing them too hard, and all that sort of thing. He did not want to press them too hard, but to get at the bottom of the whole truth. Let them press us hard, and take out of us everything that is in us. (Laughter.) Suppose, though he denied it, that they had reached the extreme limits of their conferences,—they had taken four years to that, and had not yet been satisfied even in that time, for some members of of committee were still dissatisfied—could they ask the members of this Assembly to make up their minds upon such a solemn and important matter in eight hours? (Hear, hear.) He said this was undue haste, and he hoped the brethren would resist it to the uttermost. He knew nothing so likely to raise a bar in the way as this hurry and hard driving in the matter. (Applause.) If, what he did not believe, there were any of the members of the union committee who did not intend to be satisfied, he had no sympathy with them, but he was anxious to see his way to such a final settlement of the question of forbearance as would render it harmless in a United Church, and not be a cause of stumbling and a rock of offence. If they were to be the last words he should utter, he would say that, after long labouring in his own mind to fall on a satisfactory adjustment of the point, he did not yet see how it was to be settled; but his conviction as to its settlement was that—after all the conferences, and after coming to an understanding as to the other parts

of the magistrate's relation to religion and the Church, his duty to give help to the pastors of the churches, being a question with which in practice they were to have nothing to do, they would adjourn by mutual consent the consideration of it *sine die*. He believed that would be the proper basis of union, or that some such basis would be agreed upon at last. He did not know at this moment what was meant by forbearance. Were they to be allowed the same liberty in opinion and practice as their brethren? While saying what he had said, he was as anxious as any member of this House that they should present themselves to their United Presbyterian brethren in the attitude of men who were going hopefully and forward in the work, in the expectation that the work in which they were engaged might come to a termination such as he was sure they all desired. Were they, however, proceeding to this union now on as sufficient grounds as they had for doing their duty at the time of the Disruption? ("Hear, hear," and applause.) He did not believe it. (Applause and hisses.) If that was the case, he should like to arrive at it, and see those cheerful countenances, and know of those joyous hearts which made the ministers come out at the Disruption as if going on their wedding tour. (Laughter and applause.) He concluded by moving as follows:—"The General Assembly approve of the report, and express their satisfaction with the increased and large measure of agreement under the first head of the programme, as well as the amount of harmony under the second head. The General Assembly, continuing to be deeply impressed with the duty and importance of aiming at union of all the disestablished Churches in Scotland, re-appoint the former committee with the former instructions; they direct their committee to use all diligence in prosecuting conferences on all the subjects, with a view to a final report, which shall contain the conclusions arrived at, with the grounds on which they rest, so that the General Assembly may be in circumstances to submit the whole question in a satisfactory form to the Church at large."

Mr H. B. FERGUSON, (elder,) Dundee, said, that although Mr Nixon, in the outset of his speech, he regretted to say, was going far away from the proposition contained in his motion, yet as he drew towards the end he pretty nearly came right again—(a laugh)—for his proposal that this question as to the distinctive articles of agreement should be adjourned *sine die*, was not a bad translation for this—that it should be made an open question. In common with the rev. baronet, he did admire the eloquence of their friend Dr Begg, but, in common with the rev. baronet, he was not just quite carried away by him. (A laugh.) Certainly the most eloquent part of the rev. doctor's speech was very much away from the real point now before the House. (Hear, hear.) The rev. doctor, in his eloquent peroration, spoke of the rapture of the time when the kingdoms shall become the kingdoms of our Lord; but surely he forgot that their brethren in the United Presbyterian Church partook of that rapture as well as they; and when he spoke of the delight with which the Free Church anticipated the time when the divine pledge for the coming of the Lord would be fulfilled, did he forget that they of the United Presbyterian Church were also partakers of that pledge, and that they, no less than the Free Church, looked forward to the time of the coming of the Lord Jesus? Dr Begg had vindicated the principle of the Establishment as if it was necessary to convince this Assembly that the Establish-

ment principle was an excellent thing. This was the very last place in the world where people needed to be satisfied about that. (Hear, hear.) In his speech, Dr Begg had given it to be understood that they were to proselytise their United Presbyterian brethren on the question of Church Establishments. But the decision of their last Synod stated their express *ultimatum* on the subject. Suppose they came back to them and said that they must be at one in regard to the Establishment principle, he thought they could rely upon their answer being, "We are very much obliged to you, only it is a pity you did not tell us that four years ago." (Hear, hear.) With regard to Dr Begg's motion, Mr Nixon had very justly observed that it was supposed to contain a great deal more than it really did. Why, what other inference could anybody draw after hearing their friend's speech? There was nothing in the motion about their setting up themselves to proselytise their United Presbyterian brethren. No; but in that motion there was first the immature state of the question, of course; then there was the unprecedented circumstance that only one-third of the ministers of the Church were entitled to be present in this Assembly—(a laugh)—and further, the people had never been consulted on the matter at all. No doubt, the negotiations were in an immature state, and accordingly, the motion tabled by Dr Candlish, and proposed by Dr Rainy, declared that, if they were to adopt the view that there was no bar to union in the first head of the programme, they were to go back to the union committee with instructions to give their earnest attention to the other eleven heads of the programme. In regard to the statement that there was only one-third of the ministry present, he had to say they had been negotiating four years, and although the precise point under discussion had not been before the House, the same question of the civil magistrate had been discussed from time to time, and during these four years all the ministers should have had the opportunity of coming forward, and stating whether they were bound to maintain the principle of civil establishments of religion, and refuse to go into union only if this principle was to be out and out recognised by the United Church. He could not exactly state the terms of the motion proposed by Mr Brodie last year, but it had reference to this question, and was probably a pretty strong motion; and on that occasion, twelve months ago, the party who voted with Mr Brodie was a very small minority. Indeed, he believed that those who voted in favour of that motion were tellers together, if, indeed, the minority could furnish a sufficient number of tellers. (Laughter.) Reference had been made, in the most eloquent passage of Dr Begg's speech, to the fact that the people had never been consulted in this matter. But how could they be consulted when this question was in its immature state? But they would be consulted when it was in a mature state. The General Assembly itself had not yet given their own opinion upon a single point. But he could tell the House that the people had been taking a very great interest in this question of union; and if it was referred to the people, he would just venture to say, that if they called a meeting of them, and if any gentleman proposed in that meeting any motion similar to the one now before the House, he would find himself in a smaller minority than that most respectable minority which their eloquent friend was destined to lead to defeat. (Applause and laughter.) He would just say, further, that he hoped that the House would say, with regard to the other heads of the programme,

that the ghost of a question of controversy long since passed away should not be permitted to raise itself in this Assembly to forbid the banns. (Loud applause.)

Dr DUNCAN expressed the opinion that they had not got sufficient time to take this whole subject under consideration; and for himself he was not prepared to give either a positive or negative answer what their judgment ought to be.

Dr GIBSON rose to move that the debate be adjourned, and that they be allowed to resume the discussion to-morrow forenoon. ("No, no," and "Vote, vote.")

Dr RAINY said it might be a question yet whether there might not be an adjournment if it should be seen to be necessary; but with the time the Assembly has at its disposal it would never do to adjourn at eleven o'clock. (Hear, hear.)

Mr JAMES BALFOUR, (elder)—I think it would be desirable that the House should come to some understanding on the question that has been raised as to whether there is to be an adjournment to-night at any time, or whether we are to go to a vote to-night. I think we should come to a vote to-night—(applause)—and I am sure that nothing anybody can say now will add anything to the argument. (Laughter.)

Sir HENRY MONCREIFF said they might adjourn now if they chose, but he protested against their agreeing to adjourn at any particular hour.

Mr BALFOUR, Holyrood, called the attention of the House to an overture sent up on the union question by the Presbytery of Edinburgh, and characterised the conduct of certain of the members of that Presbytery as grossly inconsistent, in having altogether ignored that overture, and having proposed a motion to the effect that there is no bar to union in regard to the doctrine of the civil magistrate. He read an extract from Dr Cunningham's "Historical Theology" on the subject of Voluntaryism.

Mr FRASER, Inverness, said, in expressing himself on this subject, he felt a very great struggle between the sympathy within him and the working of his reason. He was not accustomed to act in many things with his respected friend and father Dr Begg; and if any party were formed on that side, he knew nothing about it as a party. It would be to him the greatest relief and comfort if he could agree to the motion proposed on the other side. Whatever might be said of leading a host to defeat, it was a very grave matter for the Free Church to see such a division of opinion and sentiment as had been manifested there that night; and no man who wishes well to the Free Church would speak of the matter as merely one of victory or defeat. (Hear.) It is a principle that is for the welfare of communities that the voice of the majority should be considered the voice of the whole, and it is certain that minorities may be perversely obstructive; but surely there is a marked difference between a question relating to the ordinary management of a body like that Church, and a question relating to the constitution of the body altogether—(hear, hear)—and it was out of the question, and he assumed that no one was so infatuated and impatient as to propose, by mere force of numbers, to coerce the brethren into joining an institution not existing or dreamt of when they became office-bearers of the Free Church. He could not say he agreed with all that had been said about the difficulty of settling this question by the Assembly. If it were a matter of doctrine, he denied that they were bound to get the opinion of the courts below; but he

did think it dangerous, and he was not sure that it was quite a constitutional thing, to come to a decision at this time in such a way as might place a future General Assembly, and the Presbyteries and congregations of the Church, in such a position as they could not resile from what they had done without the appearance, at least, of dishonour and unfairness. (Cries of "No, no," applause, and "Hear, hear.") Whether it were unconstitutional or not, he would just say, that it seemed to him unwise and inexpedient to do this. No doubt there was a great deal of plausibility in asking them to say whether they were pleased with the proceedings under the first head of the programme. It was plausible, but it was delusive. (Hear, hear.) In the case of a bill passing through the House of Commons, in some instances, everything was carried if the preamble were carried; in others they had to be discussed clause by clause; and he for one would ask that those engaged in this matter would just lay the whole draft of their bill in print before the members of the Assembly and the Church, so that they might see whether it was worth being rejected or carefully considered and studied clause by clause. (Cheers and hisses.) The reverend baronet had very peremptorily demanded that they should say whether there is a bar to union—yes or no—but he denied the right of any one to insist on such a demand, and compel them to judge of the first point by itself before they had had time to judge how it affected various other points, and before they knew whether the matters had been sufficiently explicated. He could not tell whether he might agree or not, until he knew how it would affect the Church in its relation to the historical Church of Scotland, as well as the great question of education, and the support of the ministry. "It might facilitate the carrying other points in the committee," some were kind enough to say. That is a very nice way of putting it, but it might facilitate things too much. He did not hesitate to say they might go on, point by point, making each point a very small thing as compared with all the others, and thus they might be urged on, and beguiled or morally coerced—he did not mean with any conscious unfairness—into a settlement of a kind that they were not prepared to contemplate. It was not said in the first motion that there was no insuperable bar, as they would mark; it was that there was no bar at all. (Hear, hear.) If they said this, they might find they were committing the Church to far more than many of them dreamt of. The argument would be used hereafter that if they had surmounted the mighty mountains, why could they not get over the little hills of finance and administration? and thus they would find that point after point was sapped and their whole position carried. (Hear, hear.) These views he held without reference to the intrinsic worth of the statements of agreement and disagreement now under consideration; but it appeared to him that there was quite enough of jubilation over this finding on the first head of the programme. He confessed he did not see what mighty matter had been discovered. When they got unity of agreement as to the duty of the civil magistrate to "further the interests of the religion of the Lord Jesus Christ in every way consistent with *its* (the religion's) spirit and enactments," it might mean a great deal, or it might mean nothing at all. It had been maintained, and he dared say would be maintained again, that the only thing that was proper for the magistrate to do in consistency with the spirit and enactments of the Christian religion, was to let well alone—(hear, hear)—to

see justice done between man and man, and to have no province at all in the matter of religion. His heart warmed to what Dr Rainy said as to the extinction of political Voluntaryism; and he granted there had been noble speaking on the part of Dr Harper and Dr Cairns as to the position of the magistrate. It was well known there had been a rise of sentiment and opinion among able and thoughtful Dissenters on this question. About ten years since, Dr Lindsay Alexander—an honoured name in this city—in his life of Dr Wardlaw, combated the opinions of that able Voluntary, and maintained that the magistrate, as such, has to do with religion, that he is to learn his duty from the Bible, and that he is bound to provide for the moral and religious education of the community. Perhaps that is a little beyond what the United Presbyterian Church would admit even at this day. But if there be an upward progress to more just and noble conceptions of the rightful and desirable subjection of every seat of human power to the throne of Him who is King of kings, and Lord of lords; why, if such was the case, should they be called upon to descend in opinion? What had happened to make them weary of their position? What had happened to make them unthankful to the God who had sustained them in the position? What had happened to make them doubtful of the success in their integrity of those grand principles which they had hitherto maintained? No doubt they were accustomed to hear many alarming prophecies, but it seemed to him, as a man got older and older, that he thought more and more of the fulfilled and unfulfilled prophecies of God, and less and less of the unfulfilled prophecies of men. (Hear, and a laugh.) It was said to be quite futile to expect Church life or liberty except in total separation from the State. Indeed, as Sir Robert Peel was once said to have caught the Whigs bathing and run away with their clothes, so some Free Churchmen seemed to be picking up garments that the abler men in other Churches are actually throwing off; and talk, as if to the manner born, about State fetters, and the injustice involved in endowments. He confessed to a feeling of uneasiness under language that represents the whole ten years' conflict as convulsing the country for an impracticable object, and throws away a claim of right which was said to be founded in Scripture, and warranted by the constitution of the kingdom which is both ecclesiastical and civil. (Cheers.) Might they not well be reproached as a poor fickle people if they changed their course merely because, for the short space of four-and-twenty years, they had not practically realised what if once true and scriptural is so now, and will continue to be, though it should take a hundred years to prove it? (Hear, hear.) Why so rashly change their views of the desirableness and feasibility of a free national Church in a country so homogeneous as this, and sail away into space with the Dissenters of England and Scotland, who laugh all national Churches to scorn! Is this course unavoidable? He knew that many regarded it as inevitable, and the continual assertion that it is so brings to its support some amiable persons for whose strength of mind he had no great respect. Many thought we must drift in this direction. He did not like to be in a ship that drifts, and did not believe that the Lord so guides His Church into truth and duty. (Cheers.) Is this the patriotic course? Is it in the line of our history? Is it the rightful and worthy outcome of the Free Church of Scotland? He said that it was not. (Hear, hear.) In regard to endowments, though he

perhaps did not go so far as Dr Begg, he denied that the question was a paltry one, at all events it is no paltry or insignificant test of the magistrate's real position. He did not understand what the United Presbyterian committee meant by asserting that Christ's ordinance regarding the free-will offerings of His people excludes State aid for maintenance of the Church. Might not national offerings be given with free-will? But allowing the restriction of free-will offerings to the people of Christ in detail, why, and how does our mode of support exclude the other? Are not both best, provided the Church does not sell truth or liberty for gold? But that is a precaution that must apply to all gifts whatever. Two or three rich men may tyrannise over a congregation that allows itself to depend on their gifts far more than ever the State tyrannised because of its endowments. (Cheers.) Even though they should never touch another shilling of the money of the State, he held that they should pause before they told Government, that though the laws of nations may, the wealth of nations must not save the Church. Well for them to-day that John Knox was no Voluntary. If he had bid the Government and nobles of his day assign no Church property to the Reformed Kirk or to religious education, what sort of a Scotland should we have had? He was not going to indulge in prognostics, but he thought it very possible that the whole relation of English, Irish, and Scottish Establishments to the national wants would soon come to be considered with a breadth and boldness hitherto unknown in recent parliamentary history. In that case, or even in the event of Establishments being overthrown, it would be deplorable that this Church had abandoned her peculiar position, and just because of that position her peculiarly valuable testimony. And at what a time is this course proposed? At a time when political action is receiving an enlargement and stimulus, when power in the State is being conceded to the great bulk of their respectable heads of families or householders. Surely they should consider that the electors are the ultimate power in the State—not the civil magistrate—and their duty was not to relax but to intensify the hold of Christian principle, scriptural truth, and moral law over political action everywhere. (Hear, hear.) He did not consider that while they occupied different positions as visible Church institutions, they unchurched each other, or rent the body of Christ. And for his own part he disclaimed all prejudice, and had been, and would continue to be, ready to co-operate with the Church now in treaty with us, for the common good of the country, and the spread of the gospel abroad. In regard to the future, he would only say, that whatever rights Christ would have in the millennium this Church should maintain now, but they should be called to account at His appearing for trifling with any of His rights in order to gain a sectarian aggrandisement, or conniving at the non-subjection of social and national life to Him and His word. (Applause.)

Mr BALFOUR, W.S., amid loud cries of "Vote" and "Adjourn," said he would not occupy the attention of the House many minutes, for he hoped they would come to a vote that night. ("No! no!" "Vote, vote.") As hardly any elders had taken part in the discussion, and as he thought it was not a question that should be left to be decided alone by the voices of the ministers of the Church, he should crave leave to state his views very shortly. (Hear.) He would not go into any argument on the subject, but would state in a few words what his feelings were. He could

not help saying that he had listened with deep regret to the discussion that had taken place on the question—deep regret and deep disappointment, because, disguise it as they would, the question on which they were about to divide was whether that union was to be abandoned for the present or not. (“No, no,” and “Hear.”) Gentlemen had put it in their motions to reappoint the committee and renew the instructions to it, but he put it to the common sense of the House if their speeches had been in support of the motion; or if the argument that had been used upon it had not turned on the question whether they had not found out that the United Presbyterian Church were such Voluntaries that they could not unite with them. (Hear, hear.) He asked if the speech of the rev. gentleman who had just preceded him had not been made wholly on that view. He thinks it a possible thing that there might be a National Establishment yet that he might have an opportunity of joining. He thought that there might be legislation on the question, and he wished to keep himself free for that. He looked at the political aspect of the times, and he thought they should continue in their present position, because of the changing aspects of political events. Did they think that he was in earnest in his desire for union? (“Hear, hear,” and “Yes, yes.”) They did not now want to go into union, as they had wanted to go into it three years ago. Then they appointed a committee because they desired union; because they thought that the committee might be able to say to them that they should find it possible to consummate a union. For two years that committee prosecuted their labours under that impression, and all went pretty smoothly, but by and by the opinion changed, and it was discovered that there were members of the committee who prosecuted their inquiries in the spirit of trying whether there were any way to prevent that union, and if there were not good reasons for not going on with it. (Hear, hear.) He reminded the House that it was about to divide on that question, and asked gentlemen to consider what position they were going to take up. No party wanted to carry the matter against a minority; they wanted to carry the whole Church with them; and no one wanted to go into a union unless they carried them with them. He asked if they would take the responsibility of the minority, and stand between that Church and union with the Church they had been in communion with? They were now in very grave circumstances. They had the whole world looking at them at that moment for religious instruction, for religious guidance, and for help in divine things; and if they resolved rather to stand separate from each other, and continue in a position of rivalry, then they were throwing away opportunities that might never occur again in the history of the Church, and were undertaking a responsibility by their vote which should have an effect upon the history of the country, and which it was impossible for them to foresee. (Applause.)

Dr GIBSON (amid loud cries of “Adjourn”) moved the adjournment of the debate.

Dr CANDLISH—Allow me, as convener of the business committee, to say that the arrangements for the remaining days of the week permit us to adjourn this discussion on two considerations—first, that we postpone the conference with the deputation of the English Presbyterian Church till Saturday, and I am glad to say these brethren have in the kindest manner, at great inconvenience, consented to this. (Applause.) The other consideration is, that the vote be taken before the adjournment

at five o'clock. (Hear, hear.) Without these conditions it is absolutely impossible. (Cries of "Vote," and "Adjourn.")

Mr T. J. BOYD, elder, in seconding the motion for adjournment, said, that if the motions now on the table were put to the vote, and especially considering the strong expressions which had been used in the course of the discussion, the result would have a material effect in disturbing the peace of the Church. He was himself about to move the adjournment of the House, and to suggest that before they met to-morrow, the different parties who had proposed motions would have a private interview together, and arrange one motion that would be generally acceptable to the House. (Cries of "Oh," applause, and laughter.)

A member at the back of the hall moved that the debate should be continued until the House divided on the motions which had already been submitted; but the motion was not seconded.

Amid loud cries of "Adjourn," and a few calls to "Proceed," the motion was declared carried, and the Assembly accordingly adjourned.

FRIDAY, MAY 31.

The House met at ten o'clock.

Dr GIBSON (who had moved the adjournment the previous evening) resumed the debate. He said—Moderator, events have taken place, and announcements been made, among us which no one in this Assembly heard without deep feeling and emotion, though in one case the cause is partly removed. These things are fitted to solemnise our minds, and to teach us important lessons. The lesson most deeply impressed upon my mind, though I wish not to reflect on any other party, is that our time here below is short; and that unless we can be convinced from the Word of God in relation to the question before us what is our duty, it certainly is not worth our while for any personal end to compromise what we believe to be truth and duty. I have not, sir, been in the habit of making any great professions of zeal for union. They are of little value at the best, and of less use, when men who are constantly talking of their charity and love, in spite of your professions, put you summarily down as its enemies. I have to say, however, what I said in our Synod when certain gentlemen chose to speak of me as an enemy to union, that I had spoken, and written, and entered on negotiations for union before they were out of the nursery, and such union was effected, but not by the desertion of my principles; and I have often publicly said that if I saw an union effected on the ancient principles of Scottish Presbyterians, I would on that point die in peace. Had these principles not been departed from, our present union would not be to seek. But I do not much regard charges of hostility to union further than as they injuriously affect the truth. The parties who are most free in making them are not those who have done much for the interests either of this Church or of divine truth.

Allusion has been made to the Voluntary controversy. I took a large share in that controversy, and when in the debate here in 1863 confes-

sions of something like sin on that head were made by others, I said I had no confessions to make on that score. Because without professing to say I had done nothing wrong, I was conscious of pursuing the course which I considered consistent with the Word of God; and if I had it to begin, must follow it again. This was made the subject of some ridicule in the House by a gentleman capable of turning anything into ridicule, as if I had said I was perfect and never had done anything wrong, just as our friend Mr Fraser, in his most able and eloquent speech, was last night laughed at, because he said he was not conscious of having any prejudices against the brethren of the United Presbyterian Church. I have still the same view as to the course I pursued in the Voluntary controversy; and I am not very sure but that if some of the gentlemen who tell us they hardly remember the Voluntary controversy, and charge more experienced brethren with acting on mere prejudice, were better acquainted with it, they would be much better fitted to judge of a question of this nature relating to the glory of God, the duty and welfare of nations, as well as of the Church of Christ, and to the honour of the Lord Jesus Christ as King of kings and Lord of lords, Prince of the kings of the earth, Head of the Church and creation of God, Head over all things to the Church which is His body, the fulness of Him, who filleth all and in all. I trust, however, that other parties will remember that they themselves are liable to prejudices and influences of as dangerous a nature, arising, as I believe, from the prevailing spirit of error and latitudinarianism, rationalism, and materialism, rending and dividing the Churches, and far more destructive to truth and peace than any opposition to Voluntaryism.

The special points to which I intend to advert are, first—The alleged agreement under the first head of the programme; second, The alleged entire agreement under the second head; and then to reply to some statements made in the debate.

I have to remark that the following things are assumed by those on the other side:—

1st, That there must be this union as an absolute necessity.

2d, It is assumed that the sole difference between the negotiating bodies is on the subject of endowments.

3d, That there is agreement on the subject of the civil magistrate in all other respects.

4th, That this Assembly has power to resolve on a fundamental change on the principles, and consequently on the constitution of this Church.

As to the first of these assumptions, without entering on the abstract question of the nature of the unity of the Christian Church, visible and invisible, I notice it in relation to our present position. Objection was taken by Dr Rainy to the statement that there was a party in this Church prepared for union at any price. I do not say that there is. But the speeches on the other side always proceed on the assumption, that the present union we must have, and that we must modify, nay, forego and dispense with our own principles, if we expect it to take place.

Now, sir, I by no means assent to these propositions—that would be what I call union at any price. I assent to the proposition that we are bound, according to the Word of God, to seek for union, and to enter into it, but that we are not called upon for this end to renounce or to

compromise any principles of God's Word, especially when we ourselves have solemnly vowed and engaged before God and man to hold and defend them. Sir, the text in John xvii. in our Lord's intercessory prayer is often quoted in this direction, and in my view totally misapplied to the external corporate union of the Church ; whereas, it is a prayer for the complete and perfect union with Himself, and in Him with the Father, of all whom the Father has given Him, that the world may believe that the Father hath sent Him. What world? not all the world literally ; for even when the Christians were most perfectly united, which, to be sure, was not very long, the world hunted them to death. At all events, it is plain from His prayer that this union could only take place through the truth. He prays, "Sanctify them through thy truth, thy word is truth." My formula on this subject is that of Peter speaking by the Spirit of God, (1 Peter i. 22,) "Seeing ye have purified your souls in obeying the truth through the Spirit unto unfeigned love of the brethren, see that ye love one another with a pure heart fervently."

To put it as a practical matter of fact, I wish to ask our friends, Do they deny or doubt the lawfulness of separation? I suppose I shall be answered "No." Do we doubt the lawfulness of the first secession from the Church of Scotland? Do we doubt the lawfulness of our own position? Our presence here demonstrates that we did not doubt the lawfulness of separation from the Establishment. If so, are we to assume that it is unlawful to refuse to unite with others who have expressly told you that they hold the testimony you then gave, and the claim you then made, to be unlawful, nay, sinful? If all this is not to be assumed, why then are we to proceed on the principle that we are not to debate the point whether we are in a ripe condition for union, as if it were a settled point that union must take place at all hazards. I say, I do not hold it must take place unless my conscience be satisfied, on the principles of the Word of God, that there are good reasons why I must get quit of the solemn vows and obligations I have taken. No one has shown me that. There is nothing in which we more grievously err, and may err, than in applying expediency to things belonging to God. The only ground I have for taking up my position is, what saith the Lord? If you are to meet and encounter with effect the hosts of error, it will not be with an extended line, but by such weapons as will pierce the ranks of the enemy. Sir James Mackintosh says that those philosophers who make their principles too easy are like those instruments that are so flexible that they will penetrate nothing.

Much has been said of the advancing tide of error, Tractarianism, Rationalism, and Popery. Well, I say, you will never stand before it, or resist it with effect in any other way than by a full, definite, and well-ascertained set of fixed principles, not by doubt, hesitancy, and neutralising forbearance. And let me tell you, there is nothing in which popery so much delights as to see you weaken and level the fences which the Reformed Churches set up in their fixed and definite creeds against the floods of various error. If these are weakened, the "beast" knows it can easily walk in, and desolate the Lord's heritage. It knows that men must have a religion—that there is a *besoin* which must be satisfied, and that once make men infidel or rationalistic, and they will fall its easy prey. So it was that the most distinguished Rationalists in Germany went over, not very long ago, in troops to the Papacy, because it asked no

questions, and received them as they were, if they only bowed to the authority of the Church, and committed their souls to the keeping of the Pope. Popery will allow you to hold the most seraphic spiritualism, and will excel you in its specimens, but it needs distinct and definite truth. Why was it that Arminianism was so dreaded and denounced by our forefathers, but that it was doctrinal Popery? Why was it that in the English Parliament, in the time of the Charleses, that noble patriot and martyr for liberty, Sir John Eliot, got an Act of Parliament passed, making the introduction of Arminianism into the Church of England a crime against the State? Why, but because it prepared the way for the return of Popery, the enemy of civil and religious liberty, and the embodiment of all tyranny.

Dr Buchanan, adverting to our divisions, said, "An enemy hath done this." Yes, *the* enemy has done it. The arch-enemy has done it. Yes, but by human instruments; and by none more effective than by sowing the "tares" of error, and overthrowing the bulwarks of truth; and men follow their own devices, and having no bond of union in the truth, everything becomes a cause of division. It has been said that the United Presbyterian Synod, "seeing eye to eye" with us, is "the Lord's doing." Perhaps it is. But we must first ascertain the fact. I confess I do not like that way of speaking, and putting those who differ on the matter of fact in the position of resisting the Lord's doing, while it may only be resisting man's doing and man's devices. There is too much of this kind of plausible injustice done to men as honest and thoughtful as those who use such language.

A second thing I have said which is assumed is, that the whole point at issue in the matter of the civil magistrate is the matter of endowment. I deny it, sir. I do not undervalue the endowment question, but my brethren who are old enough to remember the Voluntary controversy must know perfectly well that the Establishment principle was not defended by us solely or mainly on the ground of the necessity of endowments. We defended it on this ground, among others, which has never yet been met. If you will not permit the State to recognise such a thing as religion, and to recognise the true Church of Christ, on what ground can you go to the Government and ask them to shut out their own courts from meddling with you? If you cannot tell them that, are they not entitled to ask the question, Why do you come to us and claim exemption from our interference? We have a divine right to interfere with every corporate body in the State, and if you will not permit us to say you are a Church of Christ, we will take you at your word, and rule you as a company of merchants. We value the Act 1592, because it ratified the privilege which God gave His Kirk, and prohibited its own courts from interfering with them. Nobody supposes our Government endows Maynooth on the ground that they care for Popery. No such thing; but they believe it is a mighty instrument in their hands for governing that country by conciliating the priests. You think that if you renounce all the great principles on which we have the right to endowments, if we need them, it will be safe and well. Popular power may make it safe and well in the meantime, but you have no power to prevent Government saying we are better politicians than you, and we will endow Popery because we think it a good way of ruling Ireland. Further, let us not deceive ourselves as to the future. The Church of

England is not so powerless a body as you suppose. Even if every man in this country had a vote to elect members of Parliament, I believe the great mass of the people, ignorant as they undoubtedly are, would do anything from their prejudices rather than touch the old Church of England. More than that, you have the Tractarians—a most powerful party—and the Rationalists, who apparently say the Church should embrace all the members of the community. Can these men have no interest in the matter? Our duty, then, is to tell the rulers that they are bound to give countenance to the truth and nothing else, and I hold the principle of Establishments, which we are now, if not denying, at least trying to ignore, to be a principle on which the liberties and safeguards of the Church of Christ are based to enable it to exercise discipline without human interference, as well as fulfil its high commission to preach the gospel to every creature. There is a great deal more involved in it, then, than the principle of endowments, important as that principle is. Our committee has declared we hold it to be “an act of homage to Christ.” How can that be, if we surrender it? How can it be held to be of any moment when parties tell us it is to be of no importance at all, and try to prove it is not to be found in our Confession of Faith? Sir, I think the parties have committed themselves very strangely against the Confession of Faith. Sir Henry Moncreiff admitted that could be deduced from the Confession of Faith; and if so, is not that a principle of the Confession of Faith? Are we not bound, not only by express declarations, but to whatever may by good and necessary consequence be deduced therefrom? I have said that none are such enemies to unity as the men who hold false doctrines and false views. Now, I ask, who are responsible for the present division sought to be healed? Not the men who contended for the truth. Do you mean to say the Original Secession were originally responsible for our divisions? I say no; I say they were maintaining a testimony for the truth of God and the freedom of His Church. Are you to say that we ourselves are responsible for being here and dividing the old Church of Scotland into two? No, sir, the parties over the way are responsible—not we. (Laughter.) But I may make just this remark, that if the doctrine of forbearance which has been laid down is to be carried out, why should I be condemned if I should say the principle of forbearance would allow me to go over there? I hold the negation of a principle to be fully worse than the abuse of it; and I would like anybody to tell me why they would find fault with me if I were not only going to the Established Church and generally worshipping there, but passing by the door of the Free Church, as I know has been the case with many of our United Presbyterian brethren. It is said we differ on nothing but endowments. Has any Presbytery of the United Presbyterian Church said so? So far as my recollection goes, they hold the whole question to be an open question, and not the mere matter of endowments. In the committee statements have been made objecting positively to other matters in regard to the civil magistrate. We know the strongest statements were made that to sanction certain portions of the Confession of Faith would be to allow the civil magistrate to take the sword into his hand and to come into the courts of the Church of Christ and enforce his decrees at the point of the sword, and that they will never receive the doctrines either of the 23d or 20th chapters of the Confession of Faith, which our

friends affirm say nothing of endowments, and yet they affirm that that is the only point of difference. Both statements cannot be true. I must again remind the House that not one Presbytery of the United Presbyterian Church has said that the question of endowment is the only point of difference. They say no such thing.

What, then, it may be asked, do you say to the motion of Dr Cairns in the United Presbyterian Synod? Here it is. "The Synod having received the report of the committee on union, expresses its thankfulness at the *brotherly spirit* which has continued to mark the negotiations, and with the *progress made*, and in respect that the report on the first and second heads of the programme is now complete, this Synod declares satisfaction at the *amount of harmony on the relation* of the civil magistrate to religion and the Church, as shown in the articles on this head by the joint-committee; and sees no insuperable bar to union in their distinctive principles which might not well be made matters of forbearance in a United Church; also, this Synod rejoices in the testimony which the joint-committee, after the fullest inquiry, has again borne to the unity of the Churches in Christian doctrine, as set forth in their common standards; and further, in the hope that all the Churches will see that the time has come for finding that there is no insuperable bar to union under the first head of the programme, this Synod reappoints its committee on union to prosecute the negotiations, and commends it to the prayers of the Church." It does not assert anything different, and is drawn out to avoid that. It expresses their "thankfulness at the brotherly spirit of the committee"—so do I—"and with the progress made." I have no doubt of that, but it is not with "progress" in the direction of Free Church principles. It further "declares satisfaction at the amount of harmony on the relation of the civil magistrate to religion and the Church." Still very safe, and commits no one. There is no affirmation of receiving the articles of agreement, but a very plain declaration that they must be made "matter of forbearance." Why so, if we are agreed? When the minute of the United Presbyterian Synod was read intimating the state of the vote, viz., 399, and 39 against, it was received in this House, as reported, with cheers, and renewed cheers. But what are the real facts? Out of a Synod of some 1100 members 438 have voted, 39 voting against the motion, obviously because they will not hold it matter of "forbearance;" and the 399 refusing to say they concur in the alleged articles of agreement. He (Dr Gibson) did not see much ground for great jubilation in that, for the total numbers voting represented only 438 out of 1100 office-bearers entitled to vote. It might be said that those who were absent might have attended if they were opposed to the feeling of the majority. He did not admit that as a satisfactory explanation, but he was aware of an explanation. Several he knew had good reason for not coming to the Synod, and that was because they did not approve of the proposals as to union. (Cries of "Oh, oh," and hisses.)

Mr M'GREGOR, Paisley—I cannot accept the statement, and I don't think the Assembly should receive it. (Cheers.) It is a very serious imputation upon the United Presbyterian Church.

Dr GIBSON—I state it on good authority. ("Oh, oh," and hisses.)

Mr M'GREGOR—I do not think the statement should be received. (Cheers and hisses.)

Dr GIBSON—I do not ask the Assembly to receive it. They can receive it or not as they think proper. (Renewed hisses.)

Mr M'GREGOR—Is the Assembly to be understood to receive that, then?

Dr GIBSON—I said no myself. He pointed also to the fact that the minority of 39 protested against the acceptance of the articles of agreement, and they did so because they knew that they would be supported by their Presbyteries, and were carrying out their instructions. It had been alleged that the Free Church knew from the first that a difference existed between them and the United Presbyterian Church in regard to civil endowments. He admitted that; but he had entered the committee—and he said so at the time, on the footing, not of trying to ascertain differences, but to get differences removed. It had been asked, Did he expect to convert the committee on union of the United Presbyterian Church? He asked the counter question, Did they intend to convert the Free Church committee? (Cries of “No.”) No; but they were asked to nullify their testimony. (Cheers, and cries of “No.”) He said “Yes.” If neither of them were to be converted, one or other of them must be called upon to nullify their testimony, and they must say which of the two parties it was who was asked to stand in that position. The committee had been reappointed in 1864, on the understanding that they should have due regard to their principles; and they did not fulfil the instruction if they consented to this proposal. He had hoped, however, that there would be less difficulty in the United Presbyterian Church giving way upon this point, because they did not hold their position as a matter of doctrine, while the Free Church did, and were not prepared to abandon it. They were called upon now to declare that on this head of the programme there was no bar to union; but who had shut them up to that course? They had been told by their United Presbyterian friends that they were shirking their duty, and were afraid to say frankly that the negotiations must end. He told one of his United Presbyterian friends that, if he were to consent now to the proposed course, he would do it under concussion. There was no need of this hard driving. The United Secession and Relief Churches took twelve years to bring about their union—the negotiations commencing in 1835 and concluding in 1847. The motion of Dr Rainy was either the result of the threat that the negotiations would be closed, or the result of the knowledge that their United Presbyterian friends would not act upon it if such a motion were carried. From the very first he had said that he could not consent to the principle of forbearance on a great and important question, because, when they did so on one thing, where were they to stop? Sir Henry Moucreiff, in very energetic tones, challenged them to state whether this first head was a bar to union. He would deliberately say—“While I honestly declare that I am a friend to union, if we are expected to compromise our own principles, and if discussions are carried on lowering our testimony and injurious to those principles in our own Church, I for one say openly at once, I do consider it a bar to union; and I will go further, and say, if it is to be done in that way, I think it is most injurious. Our Church is distracted largely from its work, and it might be well worth that if we were not at the same time lowering our principles; but with the two united, if we are to be concussed, I say at once I would rather say, let the threat

which our friends have made take effect, and upon them lies the responsibility of terminating the negotiations, and not upon us, or on Dr Begg's motion.

In 1863 I made a motion to the effect to enter into the negotiations on the ground that the Free Church was to hold her principles in their integrity. Dr Buchanan's motion substituted "due regard" for "integrity." I was told on all hands they meant the same thing. I did not believe it. But on that understanding I consented to withdraw my motion. When in the committee it was asserted that the Assembly appointed their committee on the principle that we were willing to modify our views; to put an end to this, I raised the question in Assembly, 1864, intimating that if there was any such understanding, I would not act on the committee; and was again assured, on all hands, as the report in the Blue Book will show, that the committee was appointed on no such principle. Well, we now see what "due regard" in Dr Buchanan's estimate means, though we were told in 1863 and 1864, that it meant the same as our principles in their integrity. Dr Buchanan has asserted in his speech, after a much less strong statement was corrected in his report, that the United Presbyterian committee expressed their belief that this Church would have no difficulty in taking the older formula of 1827, similar to our own in the point of doctrine. That committee said no such thing. It was corrected in the report of our committee, from "*the* members" to "members of the U. P. committee," and how it has assumed in Dr Buchanan's speech the name of the committee itself, I do not know. Of course, on the subject of the civil magistrate, the U. P. committee has not expressed in even one of its members, their willingness to take it.

Dr Buchanan has made appeals to the political unions of nations for their defence in these threatening times, and to the things coming on the earth. Sir, Mr Fraser disposed of this. As to the future, the only prophesying I can trust is the prophecy of the Bible; and I read there, for the encouragement of the Church, the following words, addressed directly to the Church, and of course by the Spirit to her Head, "The kingdom and nation that will not serve thee shall perish; yea, that nation shall be utterly wasted." And as to the things that are coming on the earth, men's hearts failing them for fear, with perplexity and distress of nations, I desire to place my reliance on the word and promises of God, and not on the predictions and speculations of men; to stand on His authority, and to commit myself and children to Him, assured that then we shall be safe "till all calamities be overpast." An argument was used by Dr Rainy which implied that this was of the nature of a call in Providence. I think that the most dangerous principle on which an individual or a Church can determine.

Dr RAINY—I referred to the question of duty; indeed, I wished to say I was sure it would be in the minds of all parties their duty, as compelling them to feel it was a very serious question. That was the whole.

Dr GIBSON—We must determine such calls by the Word of God, otherwise we will get into confusion, because Providence assumes a thousand forms. And though we are not to overlook the calls of Providence, we must, whether as to private, personal, or public duty, determine our conduct by the Word of God. Dr Rainy referred to Constantine.

His name has again been revived, and the assertion made that the Church was pure till his time. Dr Rainy knows better than assert that. Every corruption of the Papacy was rampant before his time. He never endowed the Church. It had immense property in houses and lands, as well as money, before his time. No state in Europe endowed it. The tithes were yielded in obedience to ecclesiastical and not civil authority. The Romish property was acquired, and the dominion of the Papacy was secured by the voluntary gifts and the superstition and fanaticism of the multitude of all ranks. It was so even in Ireland. Any one who will deny this must deny all the facts of history.

With regard to the motion now before us, I ask, who has shut us up to the course indicated in it? I say, our United Presbyterian friends, when they proposed to us in the committee two points, namely, that we, as a committee, should take upon ourselves to declare in terms of the motion of Dr Rainy, and further, that we should recommend this to our Assembly. And how are we shut up to this course? That has been told in the committee in terms I do not care to describe—that if we did not do it we were shrinking from our duty, that we were afraid to tell out frankly that the negotiations must end. They told us that in the strongest terms, warning us to beware of the result. Sir, I feel that if I gave my consent I was doing it under concussion—(applause)—because they tell us that if we do not, the negotiations must end. I cannot tell what I consider a bar to union, but I declare honestly, that if we are expected to compromise our own principles, and lower our testimony, I consider that a bar to union; and I go further, and say that if it is to be done in such a way it will be most injurious. If the Church is to be distracted from her work, I say at once I would rather let the threat of our friends take effect, and upon them lies the responsibility, not upon us. Dr Gibson read a passage from the works of Dr M'Crie as follows. After warning against indifference to the great Cause healing the divisions of Zion, the venerable, sagacious, far-seeing, deeply-read, and highly-accomplished M'Crie, in his deeply-interesting discourses on the Unity of the Church, says:—"It is no less necessary to warn you, on the other hand, against being ensnared by fair and plausible schemes of union. Remember that the spirit of error takes an active part in the unions as well as in the divisions of Christians; and be not ignorant of his devices. Of old he deceived the people of God by raising the cry of peace, peace; and so successful has he found this stratagem, that he has ever since had recourse to it at intervals. There is a rage for peace as well as for contention, and men otherwise wise and good have been seized by it as well as the giddy multitude. If religion has suffered from merciless polemics and cruel dividers, history shows that it has suffered no less from the false lenity and unskilful arts of pretended physicians—the motley tribe of those who have assumed the name of reconcilers. They will say that they have no intention to injure the truth; but it is your duty carefully to examine the tendency of their proposals, and not suffer yourselves to be caught with 'good words and fair speeches.' Have nothing to do with those plans of agreement, in which the corner-stone is not laid in a sacred regard to all that is sanctioned by the authority of your Lord. Beware of all such coalitions as would require you to desert a faithful and necessary testimony for the truths and laws of Christ, would call you back from prosecuting a just warfare against any error or sin, would in-

volve you in a breach of *your lawful engagements*, or prevent you from paying the vows you have made to God. Keep in mind that there are duties incumbent on you beside that of following peace. Violate not 'the brotherly covenant' by which you may be already bound to walk with your fellow Christians in a holy and good profession, from a fond and passionate desire of forming new connexions. Throw not rashly away a present and known good for the prospect of a greater which is uncertain and contingent; and do not suffer your minds to be diverted from the ordinary duties of your Christian vocation, by engaging in extraordinary undertakings, while the call to these is not clear, and you have not good ground to depend on God for that extraordinary aid which is required in prosecuting them."—*Dr M'Crie on the Unity of the Church*. I counsel my younger brethren to read this little work. I wish I could give his opinion on the subject of forbearance.

Here the audience and some members exhibited signs of impatience, and Dr Gibson paused.

Mr WILSON, Dundee, said a good deal of latitude must necessarily be allowed to parties in such a discussion as this, but it should be taken into consideration that there were 600 members of the Assembly who were equally entitled to speak; and if they were to speak for twelve hours a day, the Assembly would have to sit for six weeks. (Laughter.)

Mr STARK, of Greenock—I think it is not fair or reasonable that the members of the Committee on union should take up nine-tenths of the whole time for discussion.

Mr BAIN, of Chapel of Garioch—It is a pity that there should be an attempt to pour fifty gallons of tea into one poor cup. (Laughter.)

Captain SHEPHERD—The other party began the long speeches, and the Assembly should hear the one side fully as well as the other. (Hear, hear.)

Dr GIBSON said he thought that his past history in this Assembly would show that when he saw an impatient house he knew it was no use speaking, and he had never attempted to persevere, and he would not do it now. (Hear, hear.) But he was entitled to say, what he was just expressing to his friends on his left, that he could not go on to the points of doctrine when this outcry was raised against him. He was sorry there were gentlemen present that had no greater capacity than an empty teacup. (Laughter.) I was going to say that I demur to the statement that there has been agreement in doctrine. My motion in committee showed that there was not. Several members expressed this disagreement—Dr Begg and others. And I state this, that I was put on my defence in that committee for four or five hours as guilty of heresy, and I ought to be permitted here to vindicate myself from the charge of heresy made against me in committee, and repeated in the U. P. Synod by Dr Marshall, with the offensive addition that my own brethren concurred in it. Will they do so here? I have to say there was no agreement, but a long contest on that point—and I will say in one word that the motion, whose heresy it took hours to demonstrate, and upon which Dr Marshall spoke of me in his Synod as heretical—was no invention of mine, but was taken from a motion made in the United Secession Synod in 1845, and was lost by 244 to 118 votes—Dr Marshall himself being among the 118 who voted for it; and not only so, but the name of William Marshall, Coupar-Angus, appears as

one of sixty who entered their dissent. (Laughter.) This is the evidence of agreement among us. I have just to say, in conclusion, that I admit the perfect sufficiency of the atonement of Christ for the sins of all men. It was stated in the strongest terms in my book, from which Dr Marshall professed to quote. But I do not admit the double substitution—the substitution in one sense for one thing, and the substitution in another sense for another. And I made this other charge, and Dr Begg and others took my view of it. I said I preached a free gospel without reference to election, because my God commands me, and I do not ask reasons when I have the command of my Master. But what is the doctrine of the other theory? It is that, unless they see a reason for proclaiming this free gospel, they cannot do it. I say that, to me, is Rationalism; it is the principle of Rationalism, namely, that you will not obey God's command till you can understand all the secret reasons for it. And though the preacher may think it gives him freedom, what advantage is it to the poor sinner that the preacher has freedom, while the poor sinner is told that he cannot accept the offer unless he be one of the elect? Such doctrine I hold to be dishonouring to the Saviour and to the efficacy of His finished work.

Mr STARK, Greenock, said that it had been argued by various members of the House who had spoken yesterday, that it was too late now to make the Voluntaryism of the United Presbyterian Church a bar to the union, as it was well known that they were Voluntaries, when it was resolved to enter into negotiations with them. But the question is, Who were the parties in the Free Church who entered into these negotiations? It was the Assembly of 1864—an Assembly of which he was not a member, and with whose proceedings he had nothing to do. He was not even present at the Assembly—certainly had not been consulted in any shape or form—and was he to be told that his mouth must be shut now, because he should have spoken then and there? Dr Begg's motion answered the objection. There was only a third of the Church in the Assembly, and the other two thirds were unrepresented; and if it was desired to commit the Church to these negotiations for union, the proposal should have been sent down to Presbyteries for their approval; and had they approved, then it might have been maintained fairly enough, that, in so far as the mere fact of their Voluntaryism was concerned, there was no room for objecting now. But he was in no way whatever committed to the decision of the Assembly on this point—nor four or five hundred of his brother ministers—and he must hold himself at perfect liberty to object if he saw cause to do so. He thought that Dr Rainy had made a somewhat grave mistake in proceeding on this assumption, that an Act of Assembly had as much authority, and was just as binding, as a law of the Church. For what purpose, in that case, was to be served by the Barrier Act? Why, it was simply intended to prevent what had been done on this very occasion—committing the whole Church to a certain course of conduct, without consulting it. He always heard the speeches of Dr Buchanan with great admiration, and he was satisfied, that if he had been a statesman, he would have been prime minister by this time, and so he was all the more surprised with the singularly inconclusive reasoning of his opening speech. The general arguments for union on which he insisted so largely—the arguments drawn from Scripture in favour of this unity of the Church—were all very good, but somehow he forgot to show that

they were merely in favour of union with the United Presbyterian Church, and the Reformed Presbyterian Church; whereas they were just equally fitted to prove the expediency and the duty of union with the Established Church of Scotland, and indeed with all Churches whatsoever. He (Mr Stark) would undertake to show that every one of the passages which he quoted, if good for union with the former Churches, was good also for union with the latter. They must look not only upon the general reasons for union, but the practical advantages of it; and he would not like to be tied down to this programme unless they first of all settled how the ministers of the Church were to be supported. He thought the country brethren had not looked upon the matter sufficiently in that light. He knew that some of them said it would look selfish if they were to do that, but it was not selfish; they ought to look what the effect of this union would be on the Church. It was said, for example, that they would be able to reduce the number of churches in some localities. The thing was impracticable, as he knew. In a district with which he was acquainted, where there were four churches, a recent attempt to reduce their number had increased them only by one. (A laugh.) The whole result in this respect would be just that they would take in 300 or 400 congregations to the Free Church, and put down 300 or 400 of those they had. For two ways of supporting the ministry in the United Church would never work. Reference had been made to the Voluntary controversy, and Mr Adam's modest proposal was that the older ministers who had taken part in that controversy should leave the matter alone to young men, who would be free from the entanglements, as he called them, of that controversy. He could only say that they were free of a great deal else—they were free from any knowledge of that controversy. (Laughter.) He had put the question to a young minister of the Free Church whom he saw there, and it turned out that he did not know anything about it—"hear," and laughter—and that was the case with many. He was not disposed, therefore, to agree to Mr Adam's proposal; he thought those who knew something of the Voluntary controversy should take some part in getting it "redd up." He had no objections to open questions if there was nothing practical in them. He was a member of the committee of union between the Church of Scotland and the Associate Synod, some thirty years ago, and there was one open question then—the descending obligation of the National Covenants—but it had never turned up all that time, and, so far as he saw, never would. But the open questions here are of a very different nature, and will be certain to trouble the Church. There is, for example, the matter of the annuity tax, and that of teachers' salaries; while the question of endowment—the one Church holding that endowments are lawful, and the other that they are a great sin—involved, as it was easy to see, a vital question. The truth was, and he had no hesitation in saying it, that in principle they were far nearer to the Established Church than they were to the United Presbyterian Church. ("No, no," and hear.) We do not know what may be in the future. A Tory Government are just now giving household suffrage—the most extraordinary thing he had ever heard of. (Laughter.) A Radical Government may next take it into its head to endow the Free Church of Scotland. (Renewed laughter.) He did not care a bit for the question of endowments, however; it was but a poor rag of an important question. But he cared for this—he did not wish to be tied down to any opinion, and so tied

down for the future from judging as to the propriety or otherwise of accepting an endowment. Dr Rainy said—as other doctors had done before him—that the principle of endowments was not in the Confession of Faith; and it was thus intended to convey the idea, that it was not in the Standards of the Church; but he would tell him where it was to be found. [A voice—“Where?”] In the Larger Catechism. [“Quotation?”] In the second petition of the Lord’s Prayer—Thy kingdom come. In the Larger Catechism, in that part, it is distinctly stated that the magistrate is bound to support the ministry. (Hear, hear.) Therefore it would not do to say that this doctrine was not in their Standards. Sir Henry Moncreiff had said that they were not to be in a hurry; and another respected father had said that not “a single hoof” was to be left behind—not a very respectful way of speaking of the brethren who had some difficulties on this point, but it was kindly meant. (Laughter.) This was gratifying if it should not turn out to be like the rate of progress pointed at in Dr Guthrie’s “unspoken speech,” where the engine was to go on clearing obstructing gates and bars in its way, only forgetting that the result would be an awful smash. (Laughter.) What he objected to in the motion of Dr Candlish was, that it tied them down to one head of the programme, leaving the others unsettled. (Hear.) He was not willing to be committed in this way until, at least, the two questions—the sustentation of the ministry, and what was to be done with the schoolmasters—were settled. (Hear.)

Colonel DAVIDSON said—Moderator, I had intended to speak very briefly on the merits of the question before us at an early period of the discussion of last night, but gave way to others who were more anxious than I was to occupy the time and attention of the House. Since then, such a tone has been given to the discussion by the speeches of fathers and brethren in whom the spirit of the old Voluntary controversy has been so unhappily revived, that I have no heart to enter into the merits of the question now. I am filled with feelings of sad and bitter disappointment. (Hear, hear.) For four years I have been a constant attender at the sederunts of the committee on union, having scarcely missed one of its meetings, and I will admit that my attendance there has been very pleasant and satisfactory to myself. I have felt it a privilege to hold intercourse with brethren of other denominations, and it was my experience there, as in India, that Christian communion may be very precious even when we have each of us something, if not to give up, at least to keep under, and when all the lesser distinctions of opinion are lost sight of under the dominating influence of love to a common Redeemer. (Applause.) And further, I confess that the longer I have sat on that committee, the more have I been impressed with the conviction that the differences betwixt us and our United Presbyterian brethren are, for the most part, rather apparent than real—(hear, hear)—and that, under the light of discussion many of them have become “small by degrees and beautifully less.” (Hear.) Again, some of our differences, though important in themselves, are not of so practical a character as to form an insuperable barrier to union. I hold most strongly the opinion that in the economy of the gospel there is provision for union between the Church and State, but I hold that opinion with some important reservations. I hold that, as in marriage, union between a Christian man and a woman is right and holy, only on the supposition that the

woman is a Christian also, so I hold that the union of a Christian Church with a State is right and holy, only on the proviso that the State is Christian also. (Hear, hear.) But while I hold, with such reservations as these, that the union of Church and State is compatible with the Word of God, I cannot, in the present dispensation of the world, regard this as a practical question, and to my mind it forms no barrier to union. I see no prospect of the Church and State being united in a right and holy manner till that time when the kingdoms of this world shall become the kingdoms of our Lord and of His Christ. (Hear, hear.) And when that glorious time shall arrive, and the knowledge of the Lord shall cover the earth, as the waters cover the sea, we may rest assured that any difficulties we may now have with our United Presbyterian brethren as to union of Church and State will be fully and satisfactorily adjusted. (Applause.) Dr Buchanan, in his most able address in submitting the report, has truly said that in the history of the Church since the apostolic times there is but one instance of a proper union between a Church and State. But I would go somewhat further, and say that all was not quite right even in that union. In the sight of God, I believe the Church was vindicated in the union she then formed with the State, because she entered upon it in the belief that the state was honest in her professions of Christian principle; but she found to her sad experience that she erred in putting confidence in princes, and she has been forced by the sin of her partner to dissolve the alliance. (Hear, hear.) Again, I can suppose a case where a government is Christian, and the people are Christian, but equally divided into several denominations. In such a state of matters should the government single out one of these denominations, dignify it with the appellation of the State Church, and foster it with endowments at the expense of the others, I hold that such a union, even if it could be termed right and holy, would certainly be inexpedient. (Hear.) I am not one of those who are in favour of hurry and hard driving. The question of union is a great and vital question, and it should have time to permeate into every corner of the Church; or, to use a significant Scotch phrase, to "seep" into the heads and hearts of our people. (Applause.) But while, on the one hand, there is danger in undue haste, on the other, we must beware of assuming such an attitude as shall put a stop to progress altogether. (Hear.) When I went to the committee on union four years ago, I went at the unanimous call of this House, in its cordial response to the overture for union made by our United Presbyterian brethren. But should the House now divide on the question of reappointing the committee—"No, no"—and divide after such a painful discussion, how shall I then return to that committee? I should be ashamed to hold up my head in the presence of the brethren of the United Presbyterian Church, towards whom, during the past sittings of the committee, my heart has been drawn more and more in respectful love and admiration. (Applause.) The United Presbyterian Church has done nothing to forfeit our confidence. On the contrary, as the discussion has proceeded, she has manifested an expected amount of harmony with the other Churches negotiating for union. And shall we at this stage betray a suspicion to which we gave no expression at the beginning? I trust not, and I entreat my beloved friends and brethren on the other side to pause before they take upon them the solemn responsibility of dividing this Assembly on the motion

of reappointing the committee—"No, no"—and so placing its members in a most painful and humiliating position. (Hear, hear.)

Dr CANDLISH directed the attention of the House that the adjournment had been agreed to on the condition of the vote being taken before five o'clock to-night. That implied that a little time would be preserved to the mover of the motion for his reply. He had to submit, therefore, that the general discussion must necessarily close at four o'clock. (Hear, hear.)

Mr CHARLES COWAN said that there was nothing more unusual or more ungracious in the House of Commons than resistance to the introduction of a bill. Now, the present position of this question was this, to ask consent to the introduction of a series of bills not yet before them, relating to the organisation of the Church, the rights of property, and a great many other matters which must necessarily occupy the attention of the Church for years to come. Having nearly one thousand individuals in his employment, during a pretty long experience, he would say this, that he owed to the United Presbyterian Church and its ministrations much of his happiness and success in life, in their having reared up a body of servants, many of whom occupied positions of trust and confidence in this and all parts of the world. This was a solemn day. It was twenty years, this day, since the illustrious Chalmers was gathered to the Church Triumphant. During even the fierce period of the Voluntary controversy, often had he heard Dr Chalmers say that they owed a deep debt of gratitude to the fathers of the Secession Church for having kept alive in the land the lamp of evangelistic truth during the long and dreary reign of Moderatism; and if Chalmers had been spared till this day, he would have been one of the very first among them to do everything in his power to bring about this hallowed union. He (Mr Cowan) rejoiced that they were done with the crazy and rotten crutches of State endowments. (Applause.) Had they been the losers in consequence of the withdrawal of these endowments? Had they not gained tenfold beyond that which they were unjustly deprived of? (Applause.) He believed that this union, when it took place, bringing so many large-minded, liberal givers together, would tend greatly, by the blessing of God, to the continued prosperity of the Church in this land for generations to come. He did not despair of embracing even the Established Church in union at a future day. The Established Church was doing much to increase the scanty livings of their ministers, and there were many ministers in that Church doing Christ's work efficiently. He hoped that many of these ministers would yet be included in a united Church, though he did not expect to live to see that day.

Mr BROWN DOUGLAS, elder, felt much regret at the tone of the discussion yesterday and to-day, and he also felt strongly that Dr Begg's motion did not clearly raise the issue which it professed to raise. He (Mr Douglas) was therefore anxious to state the grounds on which he for one could not agree to that motion; and he hoped that the House would be almost persuaded by the speeches which had been delivered on the other side not to agree to it. He took the liberty of expressing his own opinion very strongly that Dr Begg's motion was a motion against union. ("No, no," and cheers.) He knew some people said "No;" but let them hear his reasons before they questioned his right to characterise the motion as one implying that there was a hindrance to union; and

therefore, in so far a motion against union. (Renewed cries of "No, no," and prolonged applause.) He noticed, in the first place, that every motion which the House had adopted for the last four years expressed the extreme desirableness and duty of promoting union. This was omitted in Dr Begg's motion, and he thought the omission remarkably significant. Then, when they came to interpret the motion by Dr Begg's own speech, he thought there was ample reason to say that the motion which professed to be a motion for the reappointment of the committee was, as explained and illustrated by Dr Begg's speech, a motion meaning that there was a bar to union. (Loud cheers.) Farther, he looked to the supporters of Dr Begg's motion, and he found among them those who were, as he thought, opposed to union—at least, in the only sense in which union is practicable. (Cries of "No, no," "Name, name," and some hisses, followed by loud and general cheering.) He had no difficulty in naming them. (Cries of "Go on," and "Name, name.") Well, he might perhaps name Professor Gibson; he thought he might name Dr Forbes. (Cheers, and a cry of "No, no.") Some one said "No." What, then, was the meaning of the motion seconded by Dr Forbes at last Assembly, that the union committee be discharged? (Loud and prolonged cheering.)

Dr DUNCAN here rose and disclaimed being an opponent of union.

Mr DOUGLAS said that Dr Duncan had seconded Mr Nixon's motion, and that he did not refer to him. What to him (Mr Douglas) was conclusive in the view he had taken was, that Dr Begg put his motion as an amendment to Dr Candlish's or Mr Rainy's motion, which required them to say that, so far as they had gone in their negotiations, they saw no bar to union, while Dr Begg asked them to exclude that important statement. (Cheers.) He would now mention very shortly what occurred to himself on the question before the Assembly. In the first place, he had not heard a single reason why, if they did not see a bar to union, they should not say so. If any one saw a bar to it, he did not object to his stating it; he thought it was but fair and honest that this should be said, and said now: but professing, as he and those who agreed with him in this matter, that he saw no bar to union, he had not heard a single reason why a motion which made a declaration to this effect should not be agreed to. Further, the question necessarily presented itself, whether it was very respectful to the United Presbyterian Church to withhold an opinion or judgment on this subject. (Cheers.) Their United Presbyterian friends were as clear-headed and intelligent as any among themselves—a laugh—and they would readily see through the veil which Dr Begg was trying, by means of his motion, to throw over the real point at issue. It is recorded in the minutes before us, that the United Presbyterian Church, through their committee, requested an answer to the question, Does the difference between us imply that we cannot unite? The Free Church committee did not feel warranted in answering that question; but it has now come before this supreme Court of our Church, and if we refuse to answer it, the United Presbyterian Synod can put but one construction on that refusal, and that a most natural construction—that we do see a bar to union. But some say we do not mean that; we are not against union. But what union were they not against? He had listened to Dr Gibson with the respect and attention to which he was entitled; and he had heard him repeat again

and again, both to-day and in previous speeches, what he could construe in no other sense than this, that the United Presbyterians must abandon their distinctive principles and come over to the Free Church ; in which case he (Dr Gibson) would be very happy to unite with them. (Cheers.) But what kind of union was that ? (Renewed cheers.) Dr Gibson did not expect that the Free Church was to abandon her distinctive principles ; nobody asked him to do so ; and yet he seemed to expect the United Presbyterian Church must abandon her distinctive principles. He (Mr Douglas) did not expect this, and did not ask for it. Upon that point Dr Gibson said there is to be no forbearance, no open question, the differences are to be arranged ; but how in this way could there be union ? (Hear, hear.) How could there be union if the United Presbyterian Church was not to abandon their distinctive principles, and the Free Church was not to abandon theirs, and there was to be no forbearance ? Then some of Dr Begg's party said they would not unite with the United Presbyterian Church, because they did not hold the question of endowment. But what if there are some among themselves who do not hold the principle of endowment ? He wished to ask whether he was at liberty or not to regard this an open question. He should be very careful if he found that in any statement he had signed there was anything requiring him to maintain that element of an establishment ; but he had never heard that the Larger Catechism bound him. He was bound by the Confession of Faith, but not by the Larger Catechism. He must say that he had no great love for Church Establishments, and no great confidence in the principle of national endowments ; in fact he was having less and less every year, and he was not sure but he might almost go as far as a brother elder at the last Assembly when he declared himself a Voluntary on that subject of endowment. (A laugh.) He (Mr Brown Douglas) must protest for himself, and he believed for others, against the interpretation which had been given in the course of the debate to certain passages of Scripture, as if these warranted or commanded national endowments. For instance, it was said that kings shall be nursing fathers, and queens nursing mothers of the Church. No doubt that previous promise will one day be fulfilled, but in what sense ? In the sense of forcing a reluctant people to pay for the propagation of the gospel ? Certainly not. (Applause.) But in the sense that kings and queens and all in authority were to glorify and honour Jesus Christ. (Applause, and some expressions of dissent.) They are to bring their own gifts, not the forced contributions of the people, and lay them at the Redeemer's feet. That was the way in which he interpreted the passage. (Renewed applause.) He begged to add that it seemed to him very unwise to strain passages of Scripture to a meaning they would not bear ; this would necessarily diminish their confidence in those to whose interpretation of the Bible the people naturally deferred, with the respect to which, from their study of the Word of God, they were most justly entitled. But let him state to this House there was another passage of Scripture which pressed itself on his mind. He read of the importance of being "established in the present truth." And what was the present truth ? Was it the question of endowments ? Some one had said last night that since the days of Knox, he was thankful they had had an Established Church. Well, they might have had benefits from it, but he suspected that they had also suffered from their State connexion ; and this he knew, that when they tried to lean on it

in the time of their great need and extremity, they found it a rotten branch that could not bear them. (Loud applause.) In the same hour of need they turned to the Christian people. And had they been disappointed? Had they not found that from year to year the contributions of the Christian people were such that they had astonished not only the Church itself, but all who had heard of them. Were they to disregard that lesson? (Loud applause.) Mr Stark, when arguing on the first head of the programme, had most unnecessarily drawn in the subject of the Sustentation fund, which was in no possible way connected with it, and he referred to some eight persons who had somewhere gone from the Free Church to worship in the U.P. Church, that they might escape from paying their contributions. What was the value of this argument or statement? If their people went to the United Presbyterian Church Mr Stark might draw a very different conclusion—it seemed to him to show these eight persons thought there was very little difference between the two bodies. (Laughter.) Present truth was not the endowment of the Church. But he saw another present truth which they ought to be established in—he saw in the distance and everywhere infidelity abroad, in their schools, and amongst their men of scholarship and science; he saw superstition in a neighbouring Church and throughout the world; and what he wanted was an united phalanx—at all events in Scotland, if they could have it, to contend against the terrible enemy with which their Churches would have to struggle. (Applause.) For his own part, he could most honestly say that his mind was as free on the subject of union as it was upon any subject which was open for consideration. He was not called upon at present to make up his mind upon it, and he had not done so. Professor Rainy's motion did not commit us to any theories as to union, that decision must be adopted in different circumstances and on a future occasion, all they were now asked to decide was this, regarding the distinctive principles of the United Presbyterian Church on the one hand, and those of the Free Church on the other, could they regard the admitted difference on the subject of the civil magistrate's duty as an open question. A difference which in itself need not keep the Churches separate. He thought they could, and he supported the motion most cordially because he believed that in this point the differences formed no insuperable barrier to union. (Applause.)

Mr THORBURN, Leith, said that reference had been made by Dr Buchanan, in his able and eloquent address on giving in the report of the union committee, to what had been said by him and Dr C. Brown at Assembly 1863, relative to bygone times and bygone actings. With reference to actings in the times alluded to, there were two things which he (Mr Thorburn) had never ceased to regret. One of these was, that the evangelical party in the Established Church, on obtaining a majority in 1834, should not have signalled their victory by instantly taking the requisite steps for disowning, disclaiming, repudiating, and condemning all those actings of the moderate party which were the originating cause of the secessions of the last century, and for throwing wide open the doors of the Established Church for the entrance of those noble men to whom and their predecessors, not Scotland alone, but Great Britain, owed so large a debt of gratitude for keeping the lamp of spiritual religion burning bright, when it had well nigh been extinguished within the pale of the Established Church; and for maintaining throughout

the country such a warm attachment to the British constitution when the revolutionary wave was flowing over the continent of Europe, and was even heard resounding on the shores of the British isles ; and, the other was, that the committee, appointed by the Free Church at the Disruption, for the purpose of promoting a co-operative union with other evangelical Churches—Dr Candlish and Dr Buchanan joint-conveners—should have ceased to prosecute that object after, if not in consequence of, the painful discussions which took place in connexion with the formation of the Evangelical Alliance in 1846. What had been done by them had no doubt been done for the best, and was calculated to impress upon the minds of all that if they wished the movement so auspiciously inaugurated in 1863 to be crowned with a blessing, they should avoid taking any step whereby the consciences of brethren would be wounded, or discussions provoked whereby the object aimed at might, and in all probability would, be indefinitely postponed.

What with reference to the past history of the union movement was well deserving of notice was the *unanimity* in which it had originated, and the *spirit* in which it had been prosecuted. With reference to origin. It had been his privilege to be present at the discussion in the United Presbyterian Synod in 1863, and he gladly embraced the opportunity of bearing testimony to the admirable tone pervading it. He could truly say he had never listened to speeches more happily conceived ; and that he had never been present at a meeting where there was a greater indication of all assembled being under an influence from above ; and it was in the highest degree gratifying to him at the time, and the memory of it was fragrant still, that the kindly feeling towards the Free Church displayed by the esteemed fathers and brethren in the United Presbyterian Synod was so cordially reciprocated by all who took part in the subsequent discussion within these walls, and striking testimony had been borne by Dr Buchanan at last Assembly to the spirit in which the movement had been prosecuted. From what was then said, there seemed reason to believe that the time was at hand when the hopes which had been entertained as to the accomplishment of the object for which the union committee had been appointed were to be realised. And in so far as related to the other negotiating Churches, nothing had been said or done calculated to frustrate their realisation. Very different was the state of matters in this Church,—a state of matters in which on the issue of the discussion there being engaged in depended whether the movement was to proceed as hitherto, or to be summarily arrested ; or if not arrested, prosecuted in a manner entirely different from what it had hitherto been. It had been said by Mr Brown Douglas, that the supporters of Dr Begg's motion were opposed to union. That for himself and others he emphatically denied. In so far as he (Mr Thorburn) was concerned, the union movement in the Presbytery of Edinburgh originated in the following overture, which was submitted by him :—

“It is humbly overtured by the Free Presbytery of Edinburgh that the General Assembly take into their consideration the efforts made by this Church towards union with other sections of the Christian Church ; the causes which rendered these efforts abortive, or prevented their further prosecution ; the obstacles still resting in the way of the accomplishment of the object aimed at ; and the means to be adopted for their removal, and the realisation of that unity for which the Saviour prayed, and the

manifestation of which will be the crowning demonstration to the world of His divine mission." Nor was this all that had been done by him. At the Assembly 1860, a committee, on motion made by him, was appointed—Dr Buchanan, convener—for the purpose of considering what measures should be adopted towards securing the full accomplishment of the great aims and objects of the Scottish reformers. He proposed that the report which was given in at Assembly 1861 should conclude as follows:—

"Amongst the questions relative to the means to be adopted towards securing the full accomplishment of the objects aimed at by the Reformers, your committee beg in conclusion to call the attention of the Assembly to the following:—

"1. Whether the time has not arrived for the Free Church taking the requisite steps for bringing its claim of right anew and formally before the Imperial Legislature? or, should it be deemed inexpedient so to do,

"2. Whether there is not a loud call upon it to take the requisite steps towards the formation, if not of an *incorporating*, at all events of a *co-operative* union, among those sections of the Protestant Church which, however differing from each other in points regarded by them severally as of such importance as to warrant their continued existence as distinct and separate communions, are yet of one mind in regard to the great fundamental doctrines of the Christian faith; and which, more especially, are of one mind in regard to the following particulars:—

"1. In regarding the Catechisms, Larger and Shorter, of the Westminster Assembly, as containing a sound statement of Christian doctrine and duty, of what man is to believe concerning God, and of what duty God requires of man.

"2. In regarding the thorough evangelisation of the country as the only effectual cure for all the existing evils of our social condition.

"3. In holding that the existing relations between certain sections of the Church and the State are unscriptural, and that the legal obligation at present resting upon members of other sections to contribute to their support, is not only inexpedient, but unjust.

"4. That the appropriation of national funds for the support and propagation of error of any kind, and more especially for the support and propagation of Romanism, is a course of policy dishonouring to God, and fraught with danger to the country.

"5. That all existing national institutions, and more especially those for the religious instruction and general education of the people, should be remodelled and suited to the existing circumstances of the country.

"In so far as relates to those sections of the Church which are of one mind in regard to such particulars as the above, there not only seems to be no *insuperable obstacle* in the way of a co-operative union, but, in the existing circumstances of the country, and more especially in the determination, on the part of those invested with political power, to uphold existing national institutions in all their rights and privileges, however unjust to those not connected with them;—in the increasing tendency to appropriate national funds for the support and propagation of Romanism,—and the failure of all attempts to secure such alterations in existing institutions, as the circumstances of the country obviously demand, there seem to be *most powerful inducements* towards their seek-

ing to form such an union as would enable them to bring their combined influence most successfully to bear towards procuring the adoption of the requisite measures for the effective cure of all the enormous evils of our present social condition."

It had been further said that the adoption of Dr Begg's motion would put an end to the negotiations which had been going on for the last four years. If so, it was enough to solemnise all their minds. But what was more solemnising still was, that on the issue of that day's debate depended whether the Free was to remain a united Church; or to be divided into two parties as diametrically opposed to each other as were the two parties in the Established Church previous to the Disruption; or whether the Free Church should continue or be broken up. He felt strongly tempted, from the remarks made by Mr Brown Douglas, to enter into a statement of the causes for the existing state of things on the union question in this Church as contained in a pamphlet recently published by him. But he would not yield to the temptation, and carefully eschewing all expression or even indication of his opinion, and leaving consequences in the hands of Him who sat King upon the floods, for He, blessed be His holy name, sat King for ever, he begged the House to consider what was really the present state of the question. What in connexion with that was deserving of notice was, that no decision had been pronounced by any previous Assembly, nor even by the union committee, calculated to interfere with the freedom of this Assembly to discuss the union question in all its bearings, or to dispose of the report now on the table in whatever way it deemed most expedient.

All that had been done by previous Assemblies was to approve of the diligence of the union committee, and to reappoint it with the former instructions. And all that had been done by the union committee in its successive reports was to communicate the results which had been arrived at. But whether, or how far these results afforded ground for believing there was no insuperable bar, or no bar of whatever kind to the union contemplated, the committee pronounced no deliverance, nor even expressed any opinion. And this of itself instituted a powerful reason why the Assembly should decline *in hoc statu* to pronounce any deliverance on a question so grave in itself, and so momentous in its consequences. The reason stated in the report of the union committee why no deliverance had been pronounced on the bearing of the differences which had been brought out under the first head of programme was, that doubts were entertained as to the competency of the committee to pronounce a judgment on such a question. But although there were doubts as to the competency to pronounce a judgment, there was nothing to prevent them from forming and expressing an opinion. And had the resolution proposed by Dr Candlish, and submitted by Dr Rainy, embodied the unanimous opinion of the committee or of its members, it would have been, if not a substantial, at all events a plausible reason, why the Assembly should pronounce the deliverance sought. But such was not the case. As in regard to other matters in the programme, so also in regard to that on which deliverance was sought, the committee were divided in opinion. Not only was there diversity of opinion within, but also beyond the walls of the committee. Were it the case that the diversity of opinion was not of a formidable kind, the Assembly might, without fear of consequences, pronounce the deliverance sought. But

it was well known that in the opinion of many the differences brought out under the first head of programme were so serious as to form an insuperable bar to the union contemplated. Knowing this, it seemed to him passing strange that Drs Caudlish and Rainy should have united to propose such a resolution as that now on the table. There were two other courses open to them, one or other of which, as members of the union committee, they might have been expected to have adopted: either to have proposed a *private conference* before engaging in *public discussion*, or to have proposed that the committee should be reappointed, with special instructions to take the question as to the bearing of the differences brought out under the first head of programme upon the contemplated union into consideration, and to report thereon to next Assembly. Considering that at the meeting of Presbytery of Edinburgh on 9th January last, on motion of Dr Bannerman, seconded by Dr Guthrie, supported by Sir Henry Moncreiff, Drs Caudlish, and Rainy, it was resolved to transmit an overture to this Assembly, calling upon it to take into consideration the whole principles which should regulate the duty of union between separate Churches, as embodied in the Word of God and recognised by this Church: *the latter* is the course which they might have been expected to adopt. Considering what subsequently took place in the same Presbytery, viz., that at a meeting on 27th March, on the motion of Dr Begg, seconded by him, (Mr Thorburn,) supported by Drs Bonar, M'Lauchlan, and Smith, Mr Main, and Mr Balfour of Holyrood, an overture of a different kind was adopted; the former is the course which they might have been expected to have pursued. Mr W. Balfour had read the one overture, he would now read the other. It was as follows:—"It is humbly overtured by the Free Presbytery of Edinburgh that the General Assembly shall give no deliverance on any branch of the question of union among other Churches, until the existing inquiries under all the heads of the programme are laid before the Church, and the Assembly is enabled to take a conjunct view of the whole question."

The course actually adopted seemed to demand explanation. But whatever might be the explanation, what the Assembly were called upon to consider was, whether it was prepared to say that as regarded the first head of the programme, considered in itself, there appeared to be no bar to the union contemplated. For himself, so far from thinking there was no bar, he agreed with those who thought that the differences which had been brought out under that head presented an insuperable bar to the union contemplated. What was essential to our incorporative union was this, that it should be *in*, or *on*, and *for*, the truth—a union having truth for its basis, and the unfettered promulgation thereof for its object. When He whom they called Lord and Master, and in regard to whom they said well, for so He was, was arraigned before a human tribunal on the charge of perverting the nation, and forbidding to give tribute to Cæsar, saying that He himself was Christ, a King, in reply to the question, Art thou a king? we are informed He said, "Thou sayest that I am a king. To this end was I born, and for this cause came I into the world, that I should bear witness unto the truth." What He came into the world to do, they, His professing servants, were required to be witnesses to. What was the function of a witness but to bear faithful testimony to the truth—the whole truth—nothing but the truth. But in this projected union it was proposed that in so far as related to one particular

subject, that of the endowment of the Church by the State, there should be no witness-bearing as to what was truth. Its component parts, its individual members, might continue to retain their opinions, but not to express them. Mention had been made of *open questions*. That he could understand; but in so far as related to the endowment of the Church by the State, it was to be the one question on which the United Church was to be silent.

Were it the case that the projected union was one of the same kind, with these numerous religious and benevolent associations, for certain well-defined objects, whose members it was understood might differ widely from each other in regard to other objects, and into which individuals were at liberty to enter, and as they pleased, he could understand the proposal made. But that was not the footing or ground on which they were called upon to enter into the proposed union. The footing or ground was this, that the negotiating Churches could not remain separate without sin, without opposing the Saviour's prayer, and grieving His Holy Spirit. With regard to that he agreed with what had been said by an esteemed co-presbyter, Dr Horatius Bonar, in the inferior court, as to the impropriety of the references which had been made to the Saviour's prayer in connexion with the proposed incorporating union. But assuming the references which had been made to it at last, and at the present Assembly, to be perfectly legitimate, what he asked every member of the House to consider was this, Whether the Free and United Presbyterian Churches continuing as hitherto in two distinct and separate organisations, or being blended into one on such a basis as that proposed, would be the greater sin? For himself he had no hesitation in saying, that whilst in the one case the sin was problematical, either no sin at all, or only a sin of one of the parties, or if of both not necessarily so in the other, both parties would be involved in sin of a far more highly aggravated character, than that arising from these continuing in two distinct and separate organisations.

Neither party, neither those who held the principle of an Establishment, nor those who held the principle of Voluntaryism, were at liberty to enter into such a compact as that proposed—into a compact in which the parties entering into it, agreed to cease to bear witness, in their corporate capacity, on behalf of what they severally believed to be part of the revealed will of God.

There were other remarks which he intended to have made relative to the subscription of the Confessions of Faith; the nature of the question in the formula relative to the claim of right; the question of endowment of the Church by the State, and other matters, but considering the length of the debate, the exhausted state of the House, and that other members were desirous to express their opinion, he would not longer occupy the time of the Assembly. And in conclusion he had simply to say that the way in which they would most effectually promote the cause of Christian union was not by the compromise or abandonment of any of their distinctive principles, but by holding them fast, and straining every nerve to secure that they should be recognised by the Government of the country, and the whole people of the land.

Captain SHEPHERD wished to detain the House a moment merely while he replied to what his excellent friend, Colonel Davidson, had said in regard to the appointment of the committee. He was sure there was

no opposition raised in any motion to the appointment of the committee. His excellent friend, Mr Brown Douglas, had said that Dr Begg's motion was a decided motion against the union. Now, he (Captain Shepherd) did not view it in that light. There was just this in the motions—that of Dr Candlish said that they should proceed at once, but said also that there was no insuperable bar to union under the first head of the programme; Dr Begg's motion said that it was premature to express any opinion of that kind, but the committee was to be continued. He was sure Mr Douglas, as an excellent lawyer, if he had a case presented to him, would desire to consider the whole case before he gave judgment. That was all that was required by Dr Begg's motion. (Applause.) But while he said that, he also wished to say, he felt anxious for union till lately, and now he could not see for the life of him how they could go into union without sacrificing those principles which the Church had held at the Disruption. He was grieved to differ from such eminent men as Dr Candlish and Dr Buchanan, who led them through that memorable Disruption, but he had tried with all his heart, but in vain, to see how he could consistently enter into that union and hold Disruption principles. His Bible told him, if he read it correctly, that it was the duty of kings and queens to support the Church, and he tried to make his Bible his chart and compass to steer by; and that was distinctly said in it. He could not, then, see how they could hold the principles they had at the Disruption, and still say there was no bar to union. If they would only look at the education question—he was sure it would grieve the heart of their excellent friend, the convener of the Foreign Committee—if they were to be told, as they had been told by their United Presbyterian brethren, that it was sinful for Government to give money to teach the heathen of Christ. What would Dr Duff say to that? and what would they say of it in reference to all their schools? He held that it was a great boon to have government aid for education. (Loud applause.) He would say more than that, that in the country to which they belonged it had been seen to be the greatest boon. And if they came to them and said that this is a sin, how could he and others feel then! Colonel Davidson and he had sat on the union committee together, and he had received benefit from having communion with their brethren, with whom they were desirous of co-operating; but, while he loved them as Voluntaries, he could not say he loved Voluntaryism. (Applause.) He had not got the length of that yet, and as far as he had light at present, it was his clear conviction that he did right in supporting Dr Begg's motion in the meantime. He did not wish them to think, however, that he was objecting to union; far from it, but let them finish their work. He would, if he were going to sail, have all his cargo shipped before he took the pilot on board; let them, therefore, have their work complete before they proceeded to union. (Applause.)

Captain PATTISON was understood to counsel the Assembly to proceed with caution.

Mr WALKER, Carnwath, replied to the arguments of Dr Begg, and remarked that he could not forget that Dr Begg had been one of a party who had taken an active part in promoting the union of the Churches in Australia, on the very basis hinted at in these articles of agreement. (Loud applause.) It used to be said of Anglo-Indians in the beginning

of this century that they left their Christian principles at the Cape of Good Hope, and forgot to pick them up as they came home again, and it almost looked as if the Confession of Faith had had some portions of its contents dropped about Cape Horn. (Hear.) Dr Begg had denied that those who took up his (Mr Walker's) position could do so and be faithful to those who differed from him, but he thought the articles of agreement contained the soundest principles for the regulation of Church and State, and said he wished for no more on the question of the civil magistrate than what the articles contained. It would be something marvellous, indeed, if that Assembly should not agree to embrace the opportunity of union with such articles coming before them at such a time as this. (Loud applause.) They were bound by the spirit in which the union question was opened in the Free Church to support Dr Candlish's motion. The scope and extent of it was, that when the committee was first appointed there was acknowledged to be one great difficulty in relation to the position the civil magistrate occupied to religion. It was, if there was a fair prospect of agreeing about that, then the union would be a natural thing. Now, they had found out what they started to discover, and it would not be in the spirit in which the negotiations commenced if they refused to agree to what Dr Candlish's motion required of them. (Hear.) If they looked at the motion of Dr Begg, he thought they would see it to be utterly impossible, if it were carried, for the negotiations to be continued. (Loud applause.) Looked at in the light of Dr Begg's speech, he felt that it would be insulting their United Presbyterian brethren to go on with the union. (Applause.) Suppose, when the union movement commenced, that Dr Begg had begun in such a style, would the movement not have been knocked on the head at once? (Hear.) Then they would observe that Dr Candlish's motion did not commit them finally, and it was not for them to say that the matter was to be altogether and finally settled by any resolution the Assembly might come to on that occasion. The articles were like a treaty, which had to be sent again and again to head-quarters before it was agreed to, and even at the last might break down. In thus dealing with the question, the Church was acting upon the principles of common sense. (Hear.) Looking at the question of endowment, he felt it would be a serious thing were the Assembly, in the present state of public feeling in the country, and with the speeches they had heard from Dr Begg, Mr Fraser, and Mr Stark, to approve of Dr Begg's motion. They were all aware of the feeling statesmen had upon universal endowments, and that the literature of the country was working in the same direction, and if that General Assembly were to give any measure of approval to such a feeling, it would give an immense impetus to universal endowments of religion. Statesmen would say here is a protest, but it is only so much ecclesiastical wind, and we may go on safely with the work. It would be a most perilous thing to follow the course suggested, and disastrous in many ways to our country. (Hear.) He sympathised to a great extent with Mr Brown Douglas in his remarks, but he contended that they had not abandoned their testimony to religion, and that the noblest testimony for religion was when a nation, by the freewill offerings of the people, raised its temples all over the length and breadth of the land. (Applause.) There would, when that was the case, be a far grander fulfilment of the prophecy than Dr Begg had alluded to. (Loud applause.) Then in

regard to open questions, the Church had never been without, and never could be without them. (Hear.) But the gentlemen who had spoken on the opposite side did not seem to have made a sufficient distinction between what was essential and non-essential. Open questions were one of the fundamental ideas of the Protestantism of the country, and there was nothing so likely to damage the principles of the Church as thrusting into them all sorts of minute points. Sir Robert Peel had said, "The worst injury you could do to a great question was to put it in abeyance;" but the worst thing they could do to a secondary question was to put it too high; the result being that it narrowed the life of the individual, and would also narrow the life of the Church. (Hear.) He did not, as some supposed, give up points because he left them open questions. Then, he was interested as well as his brethren in the history of the Church, and he was not about, by what he was doing, to cast any slight on the historical Free Church of Scotland. It was for the spiritual liberty of the Church that, in the 17th and 18th centuries, the martyrs died. Martyrs dying for the endowment principle! (Loud applause.) He had taken a deep interest in the struggle of the Free Church, and he ventured to say that not one of those who had taken so active a part in it would have been so stirred in it if it had been for the comparatively paltry question of the endowment principle they were contending; but what they contended for was the Church's spiritual liberty. It was because of this historical testimony that he liked the union, which would form a combination of all that was best in the history of the Scottish Church. The Cameronians were the descendants of the brave hillmen who were the forlorn hope of liberty of Scotland and England; nay, of all the world they might say. Then their United Presbyterian brethren had borne good testimony to evangelical doctrine and the rights of the people in matters ecclesiastical, and he was not sure that the old Relief Church had got justice done in that matter. Then they had the history of their own Free Church, with its grand struggle for the crown rights of Christ—they had all these three streams about to be combined into one grand stream, and flowing in a river of life through their native land. (Loud applause.) They had not given up the claim of rights, but they did not press it. They had been told of their old Scottish forefathers. He had read Scottish history too, and he had found that over and over again there were small extreme parties who had done immense injury to the Church. He spoke of the struggles of the 16th century, and said the Cameronians, when bearing the burden and heat of the day, had had their influence marred by the small extreme party. He concluded by calling upon the Assembly to follow in the footsteps of such men as Alexander Henderson, Carstairs, Thomas Chalmers, and William Cunningham. Thomas Chalmers! Dr Begg had quoted Thomas Chalmers. He thought if Thomas Chalmers had been among them, with his far-seeing wisdom and the good of Scotland in his eye, he would have swept Dr Begg's small arguments all aside. (Loud and prolonged applause.)

Mr R. JOHNSTON, elder, said the first duty they had to perform in considering the question of union was to take care that they were united among themselves. (Hear, hear.) He very much doubted whether the vehemence and the taunts and disparagements of what had been called the extreme small party were at all fitted to promote union. (Hear, hear.)

It was a question in which individual office-bearers of that Church were to be guided by a sense of duty and obligation to convictions to which they had long adhered under the guidance of great and able men, when they were now being taught to leave their old ground. It is right that men should be respected when they at least pause before they make so great a change. (Hear.) For himself, he confessed to an earlier impression of the difficulties of this question. And why, because he did not begin to know the Voluntaries when these negotiations began. He had always felt it to be one of the first duties of a Christian man to have a good deal of intercourse with individuals in other denominations from which he largely differed; but to have intercourse either with Voluntaries or Established Churchmen was a very different thing from incorporation. They may have much intercourse, much mutual respect and esteem, and yet agree to differ; but if the one party insists that the other shall drop something—that the Church shall not be endowed by the State, for example, and that on the ground that such endowment is excluded by an ordinance of Christ, it becomes a different matter. Men take radically different views of that question. He humbly submitted that the likeliest question to come up in our day, apart from lower political questions, is the question of the duty of the civil magistrate to the true religion. (Hear.) And then it becomes a question of great importance, What is the Church to do—what view is she to express? Had John Knox taken up the position of no State endowment, how could he have enforced upon the nobles and Government of his day the duty of the State toward the Church? (Hear.) It appeared to him that they ought to maintain the same attitude as Knox did. We are in times just as perplexing as those of Knox. He protested against the use made of the words of the late Principal Cunningham, as if he had not foreseen all the bearings of this subject with the matter of “open questions,” and quoted the words used by Principal Cunningham in connexion with the framing of a Testimony to the Principles of the Free Church, showing that he held the duty of the magistrate to support the Church was a doctrine of the Confession of Faith. He also touched upon the question of the magistrate’s duty in relation to marriage, Sabbath laws, &c., and said that one of his reasons for sending the matter back to the committee, as proposed in Dr Begg’s motion, was, that he did not think they had exhausted the question of the magistrate’s duty. He did not think, for example, that the matter of official example on the part of the magistrate, and his duty to consult the Church, were exhausted. (Hear.) Had the magistrate no duty to the lapsed masses—no duty to perform in consulting the Church in such a matter with a view to efforts for the good of society? In the Assembly of 1864 he ventured to put a question as to whether there were to be any open questions, and his friend Dr Candlish said “No.” (Hear, hear.) That was not his statement merely—it was in the Blue Book, as made by Dr Candlish.

Dr CANDLISH—Will you hand it to me?

Mr JOHNSTON—Having referred to Dr Candlish, he might say that when he asked the question and got this answer, he said he did not see that he could have any difficulty in acquiescing in the motion which was then made by Dr Candlish. What had changed since then? This seemed at least clear, that some difficulties had arisen which had not been foreseen. He could only say that he felt satisfied the committee had not

exhausted their duty, and that there were various matters connected with the office of the magistrate, and others, on which misunderstanding might be removed. These should be further considered; they ought to have a little patience, and give one another more time. Surely their friends had more knowledge of human nature than to think that they would persuade men by urging them on by eloquence, marked by vehemence and by a little taunt or contemptuousness. They ought rather to try to draw them—(hear)—giving credit to their honestly-expressed difficulties, and not overlooking the real bulk of the questions involved.

Rev. Dr M^cLAUCHLAN—Let me say, at the outset, that I have had some measure of fear, in listening to certain statements made here, lest what has been said upon the subject of National Establishments should be applied in such a way as to become a mere buttress of existing Establishments. (Hear, hear.) I do not intend to go out of my way in saying a single word against these institutions. (Hear.) But I am convinced that many statements that have been made will be hailed with joy and gratitude by their supporters. (Hear, hear.) My friend Mr Stark has asserted that we have been, on the one side, paving the way for our people going over to the United Presbyterian Church. There may be danger, on the other, of our paving the way for their going over to the Established Church. (Hear, hear.) We may give the principle of an Establishment such a place as that, notwithstanding our having given up our endowments at the period of the Disruption for what was of more importance, many of our own people may begin to ask, Were we not wrong in leaving the Establishment? (Hear, hear.) I do not, as I said, wish to say a single word against Establishments, though, I believe, it was said in this House yesterday that there is not a single Establishment in the Christian world worthy of the name, or that could be held to be in accordance with the mind and will of God. But in such circumstances as these, I think the less said about them the better, and that while we hold by our principle consistently, we should speak in a cautious way, in case our statements should be made the means of propping up Establishments of which we entirely disapprove. (Hear.)

With respect to the question of union, I was one of those who supported Dr Begg's overture for delay in the Presbytery of Edinburgh, and I would be glad if I could vote with him to-day. But I feel that a great change has taken place since then—a great change has taken place in the union committee. Our United Presbyterian friends have come to put the question to us, and ask a categorical answer, Yes or No, "Has any insuperable barrier emerged to the contemplated union?" This has been homologated by the United Presbyterian Synod; and the indications have been pretty significant, that if we do not give them a satisfactory answer, they do not see their way to going on with the negotiations. That weighs with me. I feel bound to ask myself, Am I prepared to answer that question? And I am swayed by two or three considerations.

First, I think it worth while to pay some price for the union of the 1500 Nonconforming Presbyterian Churches in Scotland. Then, I say, is the price asked too great? I cannot say, sir, but that I have felt pain—unspeakable pain—such as I have never felt since the Disruption; it has been a measure of Disruption suffering, so far as I am concerned, to come to the conclusion that, in the circumstances, I think the price

is not too great. (Loud cheers.) I think it is as well to say so now, as to say it hereafter. (Hear, hear.) We must answer that question sooner or later; and it is a great relief to me to have the opportunity of answering, not hereafter, but at present, that I am prepared to pay this price for the uniting in Christian union and for Christian objects of 1500 Non-conforming Presbyterian Churches in Scotland. (Applause.)

The next consideration I am swayed by is this, that I do not think the concession asked is likely to make any serious alteration in our position; that which is asked to be made a question of forbearance being a question of forbearance in the Free Church already. (Cheers.) Moderator, I believe there are Voluntaries, so far as the question of endowments is concerned, in the Free Church. (Hear, hear.) There may be ministers among us who thus far hold Voluntary principles. (Hear, hear.) I know that two elders have declared themselves in this Assembly to do so. And I believe more—that you will have ten years after this a greater number of such Voluntaries. (Hear, hear.) I think the likelihood is, that this kind of Voluntaryism may increase. Very well, if any of our ministers or elders become to this extent Voluntaries, is any man here prepared to excommunicate them? (Applause and laughter.) The matter is already a matter of forbearance with us, and all I am asked to do is to extend the same charity to men who do not belong to the Free Church that I am extending to those of my own Church—(loud applause)—so that practically I cannot see that there is to be any very great change in our position.

The third consideration that has weighed with me is this. We have heard a good deal about the leadings of Providence. Mr Fraser, last night, spoke of the inevitable. Moderator, there is an inevitable—I say there is an inevitable. Mr Fraser spoke of “drifting.” I speak of drawing. Men speak of drifting into a certain position, whereas, if they had interpreted that drifting aright, they would find that God was drawing them. (Hear, hear.) Mr Fraser afterwards said that Christ would never allow His Church to drift. I thoroughly agree in that. At the same time, I speak for myself. I know the danger of speaking in such matters with relation to others; but, so far as I am concerned, I feel that I have been drawn on in spite of my own feelings. I am one of those who felt very strongly against this union. I was prepared to take up at the very outset a stand against it; but I have been drawn in whether I would or no. I have had conviction after conviction, and I feel that, as an honest man, I am bound to say so. (Applause.) I am bound to say that I felt myself drawn; that I have felt some mighty hand around me that I could not resist. I felt that at the very time I was endeavouring to set myself against union I was drawn on, so that I was constrained to say, “Who am I, that I should withstand God?” (Hear, hear.) I might have misinterpreted Providence, but I say just what I have felt myself as one of those originally opposed to union, and determined they would never accept it unless upon Free Church grounds.

While I make these statements, I do not hold myself committed in the matter of union. (Hear, hear.) I will tell you that unless there is a satisfactory settlement of the Sustentation Fund question, which I look upon as the most important one we have to deal with, as a practical question, I will never agree to go into the union. (Hear, hear.) Unless there be a satisfactory settlement of the Education question, I will

never go into the union ; because I am not prepared to give up our 600 schools, even for the sake of that of which I have spoken as a thing much to be desiderated. I think the sacrifice would be too great, if we were called upon to give up the whole influence for good of having such a portion of the education of the country in our hands. (Hear.) Then I will never agree to enter into union unless we understand how we are to be upon the subject of worship—unless there is such an understanding upon that subject as might be held to be in accordance with the historical views of our Church. There are such questions as these between us still to be discussed, and I wish to save myself to this extent, that unless satisfactory arrangements be made with respect to such, I hold myself perfectly uncommitted in the matter of union.

Mr R. C. SMITH considered Mr Nixon's motion more satisfactory than either of the other two. With respect to Dr Begg's motion, while it did not in express terms declare union to be barred, yet there was something in what was said by brethren to the effect that such was its bearing. There was plausibility, at least, in that assertion. Mr Nixon's motion, on the other hand, was free from that objection. He preferred that motion, also, because he did not concur in that part of Dr Begg's which seemed to assert the incompetency of the Assembly to give a deliverance. As to Dr Candlish's motion, he was quite prepared to accept the first clause, but could not agree to what it contained as to the second head of programme. This was a point on which he felt strongly ; and he believed many more of the members and people of the Free Church would feel far more concerned about this matter than about the first head of programme. He felt thankful to Dr Wood for his statement, as a member of the union committee, on the particular opinions held by some of the United Presbyterian brethren on the vital subject of the Atonement, and he felt that it was a subject that would require to be very carefully and solemnly considered ; for it was to be observed, that Dr Wood's statement was, not merely that vague and doubtful expressions were used, but that the United Presbyterian brethren maintained that Christ had satisfied Divine justice for all men without exception.

Mr Smith concluded by saying, that it was premature to ask a deliverance on the very important question as to whether there was any bar in connexion with the first head of the programme, till it be seen that there is agreement on all other important matters. He was not prepared to commit himself on so serious a point ; for, whether actually in the Confession or not, no one could doubt that the principle involved had been held and acted on by this Church for three hundred years. Dr M'Lauchlan and others had only very recently seen their way to the deliverance proposed ; possibly others might afterwards reach the same conclusion, but everything like hurry or precipitation was greatly to be deprecated.

Principal CANDLISH, who was received with loud cheers, said—Moderator, a notion seems to have got into some minds that we are asked in the preamble to Dr Rainy's motion to approve of the articles of agreement in regard to the second head of the programme. No such thing. All they are asked to do is this, to accept of the statement which the committee makes—namely, that there is a large measure of agreement under the first head of the programme ; and the other statement, made by the committee—with two dissentients—with regard to the second

head; and you are also asked, as a General Assembly, to express great satisfaction in receiving these statements from the committee. No doubt there arose in the committee that discussion which led to the dissent of Dr Wood and Dr Gibson. I shall not enter into that; but I must say that I don't accept their statement as a fair statement of the views of our United Presbyterian brethren on the subject of the atonement—either Mr Smith's statement or Dr Wood's. I repeat that I repudiate it *in toto*; and from repeated conversations we have had in the union committee, and the assurances we have obtained from our United Presbyterian brethren, I maintain that their views are entirely the reverse. (Hear, hear.) But, as I was saying, my motion, or Dr Rainy's motion, really does not go farther as regards the first head, the preamble, than that, after approving of the report, the Assembly expresses great satisfaction with what the committee has told them in regard to the amount of agreement. I am not in the slightest degree desirous for anything being said on the part of the General Assembly that would seem to compromise any brother on the subject of the second head of the programme. From the very beginning I have said that it is my deliberate intention—and I will express it again—that it is my wish to avoid anything whatever that looks like committing any brother to the second head of the programme. We have most frankly told you that there was a division in the union committee, and that therefore there will be the necessity for further dealing under the second head of the programme. The dissent of Dr Gibson and Dr Wood is not to be disregarded by the union committee, but must force on them a reconsideration of the whole subject of that head of the programme; and I thoroughly agree with Mr Smith that that is a far more important point than that which we are now asking the opinion of this Assembly about—namely, the measure of forbearance that is or may be exercised under the first head of the programme—should all the other articles be adjusted satisfactorily. If the motion appears to any brother in any way to commit him as to the second head of the programme in the slightest degree, I think it would be only right in the Assembly to allow me to modify it. (Applause.) On that head I will state most frankly that I am quite willing to accept the statement of Mr Nixon in the preamble of his motion, "That the General Assembly approve of the report, and express their satisfaction with the increased and large measure of agreement under the first head of the programme, as well as with the amount of harmony under the second head." I am perfectly willing to accept of that, and even to leave out the last clause, if it makes the motion clearer. I don't mean to alter the motion in substance and sense; I am only saying that I am perfectly willing to put it in that form, if it will then express more clearly what was intended from the beginning; and that I do not want any member of the committee or of the Assembly to be in the slightest degree committed in regard to the second head of the programme. And while I accept the preamble of Mr Nixon's motion, I may state at once what are my objections to that motion itself. I quite agree with it so far as it goes, but that it does not meet the case—that it does not meet the present position of affairs—I shall proceed shortly to show, because, in my opinion, what is proposed in regard to the first head of the programme is absolutely essential to the continuance of the negotiations for union—(applause)—and the omission of that renders Mr Nixon's motion unsatisfactory to me. Otherwise it

is entirely satisfactory, and as regards the phrasology about the first head, in the beginning, I have not the slightest difficulty about it. I am not going to deal with a personal matter at this time of day; but in regard to what has been said with regard to inconsistency in this movement, I have to say that I do not pretend to be a consistent man—a consistent man always and throughout. (Applause and laughter.) I don't believe that any man, with strong feelings and strong impulses ever, could be consistent in the sense of always looking at all the corners of things when he is speaking to a particular point. I believe that if any man feels strongly, he will express himself strongly; and it is possible that the resurrectionists of old matters, or who read old discourses, and so forth, and whose memories are immensely accurate—it is possible for them to find a hole. I wish my friend Mr Johnston's memory, however, to be a little more exact, or else that he have got the book. (Laughter.) I have got the book here—(applause and laughter)—and I will tell you the whole mystery, fully and fairly. What was said was this—"We have left the Establishment; we have ceased to have any direct or personal interest in the question; but is that change to warrant us in altering our testimony before the world?" I said "No, no," to that. I said we could not even compromise. I grant that Mr Johnston was speaking shortly before on the endowment question, but the question that was before us at the time was the testimony—which I have ever and always understood to be the testimony of this Church to the general principles of the claim of rights—our testimony to the crown rights of the Redeemer and the spiritual freedom of His Church. That is what we have always held to be our testimony, and in that sense it must have been that I said "No, no," and that we were not at liberty to compromise. It could not have been possible in any other sense, for before the appointment of this committee on union I said, in the frankest way, that I did not hold the matter of endowment to be part of our testimony. I have said so from the beginning. I shall further only observe that I daresay that shortly after the Disruption we were too much accustomed to look at the Voluntary controversy in the light of endowments. Many of them sometimes protested against that use of it; but the controversy was to a large extent made to turn on the endowment question. On the other hand, we were then not so confident as we are now, I should say, in regard to the extent to which our Voluntary friends were willing to go in calling on the magistrate to own the Word of God, and to regulate his proceedings according to the Holy Scriptures. (Hear, hear.) But passing from that, I have already explained that my difficulty in regard to Mr Nixon's motion, which seems to be a very plausible one, is, that it is like the play of Hamlet with the part of Hamlet left out. (Applause.) It is good so far as it goes, but it has left out the essential part. The objection to Dr Begg's motion, and especially when interpreted by his speech, is, that it has not only left out the part of Hamlet, but that it renders it impossible for us to get in the part so as to go on with the play. (Laughter and cheers.) His motion, interpreted by his speech, implies that on the question of endowments and the lawfulness of endowments, he is prepared to resist to the last any concession, even to the extent of making it an open question. I think it would have been far better had he said so in so many words. (Hear.) And here I must make a distinction among the supporters of Dr Begg's motion. There

are some of his supporters—for example, there is Mr Denny, of Dumbarton, who seconded the motion—who did not commit themselves by any means on this point, but have guarded themselves very carefully, and I believe that not a few who will follow Dr Begg into the lobby do not consider that their agreeing to Dr Begg's motion commits them to the extent of saying that there is to be no open question on the subject of endowments. But there is another class—I do not say a more intelligent—(a laugh)—but those who know more about the matter—there is another part of the supporters of Dr Begg who thoroughly understand where they are; and from them we have distinctly the statement that they cannot consent to make even the question of the lawfulness of endowments an open one in the United Church. Let that be distinctly understood; let all our brethren thoroughly understand that that is the avowal which we have had over and over again from supporters of the motion. Some brethren seem to think that the making this an open question means that we are never to open our mouths in the United Church on it, or never to make any motion on the subject of the endowment of religion. Now I beg to tell them that our mouths will not in the least degree be more stopped in the United Church than they are here. It will be open to all to maintain the same principles which they have hitherto done on the subject of civil establishments of religion or upon the endowment of any Church. It is at present an open question even in the United Presbyterian Church, although it is well known that they almost unanimously repudiate the principle of the lawfulness of endowments; and it will be an equally open question in the United Church, only that there will be a larger number there prepared, when the time seemed fitting, and the occasion called for Government to assert and maintain the principle. We are not making it an open question in the sense that we are never to discuss and move on it, but we are simply saying that it is an open question in the sense that it is not to be made a term of communion. (Applause.) To that extent, and to that extent alone, we ask that this question be made an open one in the United Church. And I make bold to say that if any one in this House, or anywhere else within the borders of the Free Church, were to move that it should not be an open question in the sense in which I have explained, but that it was to be made a formal term of communion, he would incur the serious hazard of another Disruption. (Loud cheers.) I am not prepared to give up the principle myself; but I thoroughly agree with Dr M'Lauchlan that in that sense—and it was in that sense he meant it—you have Voluntaries in the Free Church—not Voluntaryism in the sense in which we used to assert it during the Voluntary controversy—in the sense of the civil magistrate's not having anything to do with religion, but Voluntaryism in the sense of not holding the necessity or even the lawfulness of such endowments for the Church. There are men amongst us who hold that view; and if I held it—if I avowed it—I defy any doctor in this House to frame a libel against me. And I for one will object, most seriously object, to be more fettered, more restrained, than we are by the Confession of Faith. (Cheers.) For that reason I thoroughly disapprove of any new formula being introduced about the atonement. I will not subscribe or answer any question on this subject, because I will not consent to have my liberty restrained by a hair's-breadth beyond the letter of the Confession of Faith. You may watch my expressions; you may

call me up for them ; you may show me, or if you cannot show me, you must satisfy the Church, that my expressions are inconsistent with the existing language of the Confession of Faith upon the matter of the atonement or upon doctrinal questions ; but I object altogether to any new formula being made. (Applause.) It is all very well to ascertain in conference with our brethren whether we understand certain passages of the Confession of Faith substantially and in the same sense ; and that is the plan which the committee have hitherto pursued. The motion of Dr Gibson and Dr Wood, in the committee, was a deviation from that plan. I approve of that plan. However, that is somewhat of a digression at this stage. I shall say a word as to why I hold that the measure of assent under the first head of the programme, and that amount of agreement, is so very indispensable at this stage. I do wish that the brethren who differ from us had scanned and scrutinised a little more closely than they seem to have done the articles of agreement. I do think that they have not done justice to those articles of agreement, in their own reading of them, as they have them before the General Assembly. I believe, with Mr Walker, that we have achieved in that union committee, and in those heads of agreement, the most glorious and noble testimony on the subject of the civil magistrate's duty in regard to religion and the Church. (Applause.) I thank God for it, and I am sure that my brethren who differ from me will thank God for it too. (Applause.) It is, I say, a noble measure of agreement. Some of those who spoke seemed to pooh-pooh it, but very few—I believe no one who considers it especially in the light of former controversies and discussions—will refuse to assent to this position, that we have achieved a noble testimony as to the duty of the civil magistrate to religion and the Church. (Applause.) But it is asked—Why did we put this first head of the programme first, and why did we separate the doctrine as to the civil magistrate from the other doctrines of the Church ? The true and natural sequence would have led us to discuss all the ordinary doctrines of the Church—such as those about sin and salvation, which concern the Church's natural belief and natural action—before we went into this further question of the Church's relation to the State, and the State's duty to the Church and to religion. Why did we take out, why did we single out, this particular question ? For this very good reason. Because when they asked us, and when we consented to go into their negotiations for union, we knew as well as they did that that was likely to be the pinching point from the beginning, and we knew quite as well as they knew that, unless we got over that, we need not go any farther—(applause)—that unless under this first head of the programme we successfully came to an issue on which we could agree, it would be utterly vain and hopeless to expect success in the negotiations for union. (Applause.) That, then, was our reason for separating that head from the others, and placing it first on the programme. We all knew that the obvious, primary, and preliminary barrier to union was not so likely to be met with in any of the other matters embraced in the other heads of the programme, but was sure to be in this particular one. We have been labouring for a good many years with a view to overcome this difficulty, and now we have arrived—as the committee think, and, I believe I may say, as the General Assembly think—we have arrived at as close an agreement as is possible under this first head

of the programme. No doubt Dr Begg says, "Oh, reappoint your committee, resume the negotiations with the United Presbyterian brethren on the first head of the programme." Ah, but he accompanies this with the statement, "Let them come ever so much closer to our views in regard to the lawfulness of establishing the Church, unless we succeed in inducing them to adopt ours, the negotiations will be broken off." Now, what is the use of discussing with the United Presbyterian brethren on the first head of the programme with such a statement in view? I think that would be a cause of offence—a grievance of which they would be quite entitled to complain, and say, "Nay, Dr Begg; tell us at once that you will not concede one iota as regards this principle about the lawfulness of endowments—tell us plainly, and in so many words, and then we will understand you; but don't come and ask us to confer on this first head of the programme, giving us the notion that you will consent if we are to come verbally, apparently a little closer to one another." They would be entitled to say to us, in that case, what I have now stated; but the time seems to me, and to others who support this motion, to be fully come when, after four years' deliberation on this first head of the programme, for telling our United Presbyterian brethren if we see that there is a bar to union in it. They are entitled to know that, even apart from the proceedings of the Synod to which I, like Dr M'Lauchlan, attach great weight—even apart from that, we are to feel it due to ourselves, due to our own consistency, due to our own honour, and due to our good faith, to tell them plainly at this stage that we do not see, so far as at present advised, a bar to union under the first head of the programme. I think they are fairly entitled to ask that, and we are bound to offer it to them without their seeking it, for this reason—As regards the principle of making the lawfulness of endowing the Church an open question, I may observe that it is an open question with the United Presbyterian Church at any rate at present; and they want to know whether we can make it an open question with us, as they have done, and what is more, I think they are entitled to have that distinctly answered yea or nay. Of course I reserve to myself, if needful, on this first head of the programme, as I do on all the other heads of the programme, the power to say that it requires reconsideration. It is to make that clear that I afterwards introduced the words "while reserving final judgment on the whole case, and every part thereof," and not for the purpose of catching votes; and to charge me with this is very unworthy of any minister of our Church. (Applause.) I disclaim it with indignation.

Mr SAWERS, of Gargunnoch, rose amidst some slight confusion, and was understood to say that such language ought not to be used in this House.

Dr CANDLISH—I repeat that the charge imputed to me of adding a clause to the motion for the purpose of catching votes I regard as a personal insult. (Loud and prolonged cheering.) We framed and worded the motion as cautiously as we could, simply for the purpose of showing the Assembly the length to which they were asked to commit themselves at this stage, and to make that plain and palpable, we merely wished the Assembly to say that we might go forward without that barrier to union standing in the rear—that we might go forward, telling our United Presbyterian brethren that if otherwise we could agree we would not be shut out from the union under the first head of the programme. That is all the length

to which we asked the Assembly to commit themselves. I would like to state, with regard to the form of the motion, where it is said that after the re-appointment of the committee, "being of opinion, as at present advised, that as regards the first head of the programme, considered in itself, there appears to be no bar to the union contemplated, the General Assembly, while reserving judgment on the whole case, and every part thereof, direct the committee," &c.—I understand that some of the friends in this House have been led to fear that there lies more under this general form than it really and truly implies. They may hold out that it involves more than we admit; and I have not the least objection to adopt more explicit phraseology, if any one can suggest it, so as to make the motion clearer in its meaning. (Applause.) And now, Moderator, before going to the vote, I cannot go into the arguments that have been urged on the opposite side, but I may be allowed a few words as to what I regard as the extreme importance of the present crisis. I believe—I am perfectly sure, as far as I can be sure of anything in regard to the future, I believe that unless we tell our brethren "Yea" or "Nay" what we really mean to accept under the first head of the programme, you may discharge your committee, and it will be utterly useless to hope that the negotiations will go forward. I believe that, not from any idea that our brethren would without reluctance break off the intercourse we have had with them. They are most honourable men. (Applause.) In the intercourse we have had with them they have shown a measure of forbearance, of loving-kindness, and of confidence in our honour and integrity—in fact, they have shown everything that could be expected from Christian men and brethren. (Applause.) But they would like—and, I believe, in all fairness they are entitled—to know what we really mean to accept under this first head of the programme; because it is really of no use to go on any longer with these negotiations if, though you had adjusted all the other heads of the programme, there is that fundamental and radical objection, that you won't agree to make the question of the endowment of religion an open question. Make it an open question, and see how far we can carry it ultimately. With regard to the charges that have been made, to the effect that we are trying to hurry on the matter—that we were having recourse to hurry and driving—I hope that after what I have said that impression may be avoided. Why, if we were to-day sending down final overtures to the Presbyteries, there might be something in that; we might then be said to be coercing our brethren; but if all that we are doing is in the way of enabling the negotiations to go on, I really don't see why forbearance should not be on their side rather than on ours. I think that our brethren on the other side might so far allow us to go on, and I hope that they will reserve for a little their judgment on this head. Some of them have already committed themselves, but others again, let it be remembered, have not, and I hope those who support Dr Begg's motion will reserve their opinions till we get further advanced on the subject. If it was four years before we were brought to this conclusion, and if we go on at the same rate over the other ten heads of the programme, I don't think our friends need be afraid of too great haste. (A laugh.) We have not proceeded in haste hitherto. Any imputation of haste or hurry thrown out in the course of the debate will be no more than like—"the snowflake on the river"—a few days will put an end to the whole of that

idea. Then, again, it is said that we will carry this union by a majority. We have not said that we will not wait as long as those of our brethren who have any hesitation in the matter. We are not to push the movement—we are not to coerce the conscience of any man. I do hope that the General Assembly will feel the great responsibility in which, as a Church, we are now placed. In regard to this question of union, I have always looked upon it rather in the light of duty than in the light of expediency. I am not blind or indifferent to considerations of expediency in this question—to the good and the advantage which may be expected, under the Divine blessing, to result from it, by so compact a testimony to the truth as will be borne by the whole of the dis-established Churches throughout Scotland being united together. (Applause.) I am not blind or indifferent to the advantages that would give us in dealing with the masses, in converting the outcast, in carrying the gospel of the grace of God over the whole of the land. (Applause.) I am not blind or indifferent to these considerations—far from it; but I repeat I have always looked on this question rather in the light of duty than in the light of advantage or expediency. (Renewed applause.) I said, when the subject was first broached in this House, that I thought that was the right view to take of it—that the *onus probandi*, the burden of proof, in my mind, lies on the side of refusing to unite—the whole presumption, *prima facie*, founded on the Divine Word must be in favour of union. It is the duty of the Christian Churches to unite, unless very serious obstacles interpose. There is a serious enough obstacle between us and the Establishment. Our testimony there, as Mr Fraser has said, is clear and decided. But we did not see that there was any insuperable difficulty to entering into negotiations four years ago; although we might have foreseen what has happened now—nay, we could not even then have supposed that there was such a large and ample amount of honest agreement on this subject. (Applause.) But I believe, sir, that the duty lies on the side of union. I agree very much with what fell from Mr Fraser last night. I agree with him very much, that we are bound, as far as possible, to regulate the affairs of the Christian Church here below after the model set forth in the New Testament of the spiritual Church of the elect and saved. That was the principle upon which we met those who pleaded for Christ's Headship over the invisible Church—those who held high views on that point. Our answer to them continually was, that it is our duty to make the visible Church of Christ on earth as far as possible identical with and after the model of the invisible Church—that whatever rules were laid down for the one, we should make as far as possible applicable to the other. I therefore agree very cordially with what Mr Fraser said last night. More than that; I agree with him further in thinking that we should not wait for the millennium before we do this. I hold that, though the doctrine of the millennium, whether it be *pre* or *post*, has been a good deal abused. We find that some are endeavouring to reconcile this with the existing imperfections and abuses in the Church, saying, "Wait, wait, till all these be removed and put to rights, when the Lord himself will come." Now, sir, I agree with Mr Fraser completely that we must regulate our proceedings now so as to be doing His will as we would like to be found doing it when He shall appear. I think, therefore, with Mr Fraser that, apart altogether from the question of

the millennium, which is an open question among us—I mean *post and pre*—that we are bound to do now what we would like to be found doing when the Lord comes. (Applause.) There was no appearance last night of sneering at this great doctrine—and I would not like to see it—but holding that view, I am all the more in favour of going forward in this movement for union. Beyond a doubt the invisible Church has no breach, and it is our bounden duty to do what in us lies to make the visible Church in this respect as like as we possibly can to the invisible Church. (Applause.) I agree with Mr Fraser, that the instant other Churches come as near to us, or within a mile of being as near us as our United Presbyterian brethren now are—the moment other Churches come so near to us that we see our way even to the possibility of union with them—be they Established or any other Churches—I hold that our duty is the same, as regards our seeking a union. We are bound to watch and look out for opportunities of healing the breaches in the Lord's vineyard; and whatever Church, or branch of the Church, in the land it may be that comes near to us and offers us a plausible and probable ground of our being able to see eye to eye so far as to be able to work together, I have no doubt that the right hand of fellowship should be extended to enter into negotiations with them, and, sinking minor differences, we should endeavour to come to a thorough understanding on the essentials, and go forth united on the Lord's side. (Loud applause.)

Dr FORBES, who rose amid loud cries of "Vote," said the Church was now placed in a position as difficult and as solemn as any in which she found herself at the period of the Disruption, and he believed that great results must necessarily follow the resolution to which the Assembly might come that day. He thought that much confusion of language had been introduced into the discussion. The term "open question" had been referred to again and again. These words were plain enough, and were associated with no bad feelings in their minds; but he thought the Assembly should be cautious of being misled by generalities on a question of this kind, and should look at it from a practical point of view. Their judgment should be guided, not by mere verbiage, but by reason and facts. Now, his objection to the first head of the programme being held an open question was based on two points. The first was, that the United Presbyterian committee had set forth and declared that they consider State endowments of religion contrary to the ordinances of Christ, and therefore sinful. They also hold that State endowments are incompatible with the spiritual liberties of the Church of Christ; and he (Dr Forbes) maintained that, if the Free Church consented to make these two important matters an open question, they would be departing from what had always been understood to be the constitutional principles of the Church of their fathers. ("No, no," and applause.) Why, if the first principle be conceded, they would just be saying in effect that they were making an open question of what was hitherto held to be a material matter of belief, and that they were living in a state of systematic sin up to the period of the Disruption. ("Oh, oh.") With regard to the second point, that the Church's liberties could not be maintained in compatibility with the acceptance of endowments, that virtually amounted to this, that the Disruption was a justifiable act on the part of the State, that they were doing nothing more than their duty, and that the mem-

bers of this Church were most unreasonable, factious, blinded men to expect at once endowments and spiritual independence in the circumstances in which they were placed. He regretted that they were pushed up into a moment of time to settle their judgment upon this matter. They were now in the position that they must come to a decision, and he thought the only safe decision was the one held out by the motion of Dr Begg, because it did not commit them to any judgment whatever upon the present position of this great and momentous subject. He had heard much that day—and he entirely approved of every word that was said—that the preliminary principle involved in this question required that they should do everything for peace and union; but they should be careful lest they carry that principle too far, because, if they did so, they would condemn the noble exertions of those martyrs and confessors of the Church who had been raised up by God to maintain the truth, under the penalty of being denounced as schismatics and heretics. (“Oh, oh,” and applause.) It was their duty to take care that, whilst maintaining the peace of the Church and seeking to promote its union, they did so upon principles that were scriptural, and, therefore, upon a foundation that they might hope would be blessed of God. It had been said that this matter had been brought to such a position, that if the Assembly was not yet satisfied that the question about the relation between the civil magistrate and the Church was to be justified upon the terms of the programme, it would be tantamount to giving up the whole question of union. If that was the case, the responsibility would lie upon the United Presbyterians and not upon this Church. But he thought better of their United Presbyterian friends than that they would take themselves off, so to speak, and terminate the negotiations now going on, merely upon the ground that the Free Church could not see their way, as at present advised, to say that the proceedings of the joint-committees afford a satisfactory ground for the settlement of this question. (Hear, hear.) Last year he felt it his duty to second a motion for the dissolution of the committee. He did so on the ground that no advance had been made by the committee during three years of negotiations, and he apprehended that they should be launched into eternal division. He did not think that they had made much progress still, and he thought it more important that they should seek the peace of Jerusalem, and endeavour to promote its progress and prosperity in a way that would not compromise their vital constitutional principles. (Applause.)

Principal LUMSDEN thought it only dutiful in him to say that, having been present at the discussion in the union committee regarding the article of doctrine, he differed entirely from Dr Wood and Dr Gibson in the account they had given of the difference between them and their United Presbyterian brethren. In the exposition of their views, he admitted that United Presbyterian members of the committee used expressions he could not adopt, expressions which were not, in his opinion, scientifically correct, and which, if they were, a theological debating club would have formed a tempting opportunity for debate; yet no views were uttered contrary to these—first, that Christ, by His death, satisfied Divine justice as a substitute for the elect only; and, second, the doctrine, as stated by confessedly evangelical writers of our Church in the last century, that mankind, sinners, as such had all of them a common interest in Christ and His salvation. He had ever been one of those most anxious for

this union, or most sanguine of its consummation and results. But he felt himself constrained to support Dr Rainy's motion on these two considerations. The one was, that the one point on which there exists difference—the lawfulness of the civil magistrate endowing the Christian Church, even if it could be made out to be an article of our creed—must at the best be regarded as a subordinate one, and therefore not necessary at all times and under all circumstances to have a place in our creed or in the creed of a complete, and faithful, and scripturally constituted Church, and therefore cannot be regarded as adequate, *per se*, to bar union. If we had seen at the time this committee was appointed, four years ago, that the distinction between the duty of the magistrate to endow pastors of regularly organised congregations, and the other parts of the Establishment principle, as it was called, existed as clearly in the minds of our United Presbyterian brethren as in our own, he rather thought that we would even then have said that the negotiations might be entered on, with the understanding that there might on this one point be forbearance. Another reason was, that it had been insinuated that many of our United Presbyterian brethren had not voted in this recent majority in good faith, and that many were absent because they would not vote for the articles of agreement. Well; be it so. Let us then put them to the proof. Let us not, by such a motion as that of Dr Begg's, obstruct the progress of this work, but rather do everything on our part that will afford every facility for this adverse feeling, if it exists, being brought out, instead of affording, in our apparent reluctance, a handle to any of the United Presbyterians who are adverse to the points of agreement.

Dr RAINY said there are many members of this Assembly who may not have been accustomed to take perhaps a very prominent part in these discussions, but who have been watching the whole course of affairs, who might have been heard with great advantage to the progress of this question, but who have been hindered from taking part in it by the immense disproportion between the members of Assembly and the number who may take part in the debate. I think it almost effrontery for me to speak again with the consciousness that this is the case; at the same time, it is within the line of my duty to concentrate the attention of the Assembly once more upon the real issue.

I think we must all be suffering under the influence of that feeling of dispersion of mind which arises from having presented to us such a great number of considerations more or less bearing on the question. If I may say so, I do feel that a good many of the speeches were more in the way of affording a certain number of miscellaneous observations, more or less connected with the case, than a plain grappling with the question of the considerations of duty, and the order and the way in which those considerations of duty apply themselves to one another, and the issue the Assembly has to settle. I feel it with all the bitterness of a personal humiliation, that, after having made it my business to lay down, as I best could in the circumstances of an extempore speech, the *status questionis* at the beginning of the discussion, and after having listened for what I thought it the duty of an Assembly of divines to do—to argue the question on the *status* laid, or show clearly that that *status* is wrongly stated—I am now in the humiliating position that not a single individual has felt it worth his while to look at my *status ques-*

tionis, because, I suppose, they felt that it was not worth speaking about, and left it alone out of tenderness to myself. (Laughter and applause.) I am sorry for this, even without regard to myself. I could have wished that somebody had done something in this direction, or that I myself had not so altogether failed in stating my mind as that we should have had this from the other side of the House professing to be a denial of our position—that they refuse to admit that “there ought to be union at all hazards!” If that is all the length we have got in the debate, we are in a very unfit state to go to the vote. (Laughter.)

I entirely agree with Dr Candlish that the reference to the second head of the programme was never intended to serve any other purpose than that which he explained. The committee have told you that, with two exceptions, they can repeat their assurance of a gratifying agreement. If the Assembly pass that without taking any notice of it, they will seem to indicate a suspicion which the Assembly do not want to indicate, even though they may not be prepared to say anything particular on the subject. Therefore, we thought it would be the mind of the Assembly to express its satisfaction that the committee felt itself in a position to say what they have said. I do not care how you deal with that; but I do not want you to do anything to indicate suspicion. With regard to the statements of Dr Wood and Mr R. C. Smith, I am in the hands of the House. I am rather inclined to think that, at this late period, and with the exhaustion of the House, it may not be wise to go into the subject. I am perfectly prepared, however, to go on—(cries of “Go on”)—and perhaps a general statement may be clear enough to be sufficient.

Under the first head of the programme there was a known divergence. We began with that, and the *onus* lies on those who say that it is reduced sufficiently to be taken out of the way. But on the other hand, we start with a common Confession; and in the case of the second head, the *onus* lies on those who assert that there is a difference. We in the committee thought we ought to avoid new formulas, but we thought that we might satisfy men's minds by using citations from our common Confession. Some might have thought that though in the two Churches we were agreed on a certain Confession, yet there might be in one Church or other some articles which in that Church by common consent were held not to be so definitely and peremptorily enforced. Such a state of things may exist without any dishonesty, though not without some defect of duty, as I think. It was possible that might be imagined. We thought that such suspicions would be cured by taking out the passages referring to the subject, and stating that the Churches agreed *ex animo* on all these statements as to which differences might be supposed to exist. It was merely as supplementary to that we said we will go into conversation on these extracts, and see if we understand the statements in the same way, so that we may quiet vague suspicions. We did so last year, and came up with an undivided report; and this year we have been at it again, and the committee come up with the same impression, with the exception of two members of committee.

I am sorry to think, when I interrupted Dr Wood yesterday, that there seemed to be an impression that I had done so with a want of respect. I interrupted him because I thought it more respectful to do

so than to sit on my seat and cry "No, no!" as he was going on. And I am the more anxious to say this, because Dr Forbes, whom I equally respect, seemed to have a feeling as if he had not understood my object; and I should be sorry, in a matter of this kind, to deserve the censure of Dr Forbes, who always himself speaks with the good feeling of a scholar and a gentleman. (Applause.)

Now, with regard to laying down a set of alternatives or propositions with a view to settle the sense in which you understand the Confession of Faith, everything depends on the kind of proposition you apply to test the matter. Now, I have to say of both Dr Gibson's and Dr Wood's motion in the committee, that it was not fair or reasonable to expect that our United Presbyterian friends could do anything else than take a precautionary attitude, disputing that statement as a complete statement. Whether they are right or wrong, they made it plain to us in the committee that they regarded themselves as the guardians of a certain view of the presentation of the gospel, which they thought descended to them from Fisher and the Erskines, and which they regard themselves as bound to take care shall not be shut out or excluded. They have that impression, and therefore they have a sensitiveness in going into statements of the question of the atonement as co-extensive with salvation. I take leave to say that it was not the wont of orthodox divines to content themselves with saying that the atonement is co-extensive with salvation when they professed to be giving a complete statement on that head.

Dr WOOD—I did not use the words at all; the words were "satisfaction to justice."

Dr RAINY—Well, I will speak of that presently. I say that our divines have been careful to acknowledge that other matters besides the salvation of the elect are secured by the atonement. Now, the question which is the starting-point of this whole subject is, whether among those other matters is the basis of the gospel offer to all men, by reason of the sufficiency and suitableness of the atonement for all. Men may differ on that point, but undoubtedly in Fisher's Catechism it is laid down most precisely that the sufficiency is the basis of the offer.

"Very well, then," our friends say further, "we know you admit the sufficiency of the atonement, but it strikes us that a number of you who admit that, think it is enough to treat that sufficiency as a mere incident that arises in the progress of the administration of the covenant of grace to reach its ends in the elect." I do not say they are right in that impression, but I do not think it a very unnatural one, for reasons that will presently appear. And they say, "We can never take that view of it. For in this sufficiency and suitableness, held forth in the gospel, the atonement has so much of a reference to mankind sinners as such, that every sinner to whom the gospel comes, and it might be carried to them all, is thereby placed in a new and wonderful position, in which the love and grace of God are manifested to him in such a way as to transmute altogether his moral position as the subject of moral obligations, and as a man under responsibilities to God."

Now, observe, in making out their ground from these points, they had to take great care to be represented to their people as not giving up

something. For my part, although our divines have always admitted that there is a sound sense in which to say that Christ died for all men, I always myself avoid speaking of the atonement and satisfaction in that style, because the language lends itself so readily to an Arminian sense, and I think I can express it better another way. But I can hardly tie up other men to the same view of what is a fitting expression. Moreover, let this be remembered: Dr Wood says—and I admit—that we have been accustomed to make a certain difference between the usage of the words atonement and satisfaction. It has been said that “atonement” may be regarded as ambiguous, but at all events “satisfaction” is always understood as implying that substitution of Christ for His people, which is the condition securing their actual salvation; and I think it very useful to employ the word with that association—yet really there is no such difference in the meaning of the two words intrinsically. An atonement is a satisfaction. And if a man fears to be ensnared by a statement about the atonement, he may just as well fear to be ensnared by a statement about the satisfaction—unless he makes his meaning very plain. Now, that was just what our United Presbyterian friends feared. In point of fact, they were afraid of seeming to give up ground concerning the law-magnifying righteousness, as provided for men to take possession of by faith. And in explaining their views they may have made such statements as Dr Wood cites—I don’t know that I could from my own memory deny it—when speaking in a *continuous* context with explanatory statements before and behind; yet when making any rounded statement that was to stand by itself, I feel certain of my recollection that they always introduced some qualifying clause, derived from the all-sufficiency, so as to make it clear that they pointed to the law-magnifying righteousness, which is so for all, that every man is called to enter on possession by faith. And it would be easy to illustrate why they felt so resolute against making admissions which we might imagine to be reasonable.

One illustration of many I might give. The question in the Larger Catechism was taken, and it was said to us, “How do you interpret in the Larger Catechism this—that ‘grace provideth and offereth to sinners a Mediator?’” This is in describing the covenant of grace. Well, it was said to us, ‘What do you mean by sinners?’ Does it mean mankind sinners without distinction, or not?’ I was prepared to say that that question of the Catechism considered the covenant of grace as it comes into manifestation. My view is that it is mankind sinners, and then, in connexion with this manifestation thus providing and offering to sinners a Mediator, the special result is reached in the case of the elect. There were some members of our committee not clear that this was the safe way of stating it, and different distinctions were offered as to the kind of sinners to whom it was stated in the question that there was offered the Mediator. I do not give my judgment as much worth, but I hold in that question that the meaning is, that the grace manifests itself by the offering of Christ to mankind sinners. But it was said by some among us that cannot be the meaning, because the covenant, as it is explained in the preceding question, contemplates the elect, and therefore “sinners” cannot be taken as sinners generally. Our United Presbyterian friends were disposed to say, “If these are the views we have got to deal with, we must be very cautious what we

admit here." And they could not but feel this. Why, Fisher's Catechism, while it states with perfect clearness that the covenant of grace contemplates the elect, yet goes on to say that the first and fundamental act of the administration of the covenant is the ordaining it into a testament, and the objects of the testament are mankind sinners as such.

What I have said may show the Assembly that there are two ways of understanding those discussions. But it is quite right men should be cautious who feel a difficulty in thinking they have sufficient ground of satisfaction on the point; and, for my part, it would give me great pleasure if the Assembly would appoint Mr Ralph Smith to be on the committee. All of us who are of the same standing remember the benefit we derived by his presence in the Hall, from his high character, his thorough honesty, and the example he set us; and nothing would gratify myself personally more than to have him associated with us.

And now, sir, with regard to the motions before us. In objecting to Mr Nixon's motion, I may observe that Mr Nixon is a sincere friend of union, and that whoever is opposed to union, he is not. Therefore his motion is in perfect good faith, and is made with an eye to the advantage of the question. But, sir, I say Mr Nixon's motion will not do, and for this reason, that under the cover of the motion a substantial injury may be done, which Mr Nixon would be the last man in the world to intend. (Hear, hear.) It will not do, because it has now become necessary for us to face the question, and to answer it. We have to face the question, and can it be said that we are hurried in facing it? Is it true to say that after all these four years we are not ready to face it? Why, are we not here as men of intelligence and practical ability? What could any man, looking at the question with any degree of intelligence, expect four years ago, but that the best and furthest we could possibly get should be just the position in which we are at this day? (Applause.) I do not know what more was ever in sight; and when our friends in the United Presbyterian committee have got so far on the furthest horizon of our hope, that while they are not prepared to admit the lawfulness of endowments, they are at one with us on the substantial point of the Headship of Christ over the nations, surely the question that arises is the very question that rose before us from the first. Is it to be said that our minds have been lying fallow all the time upon the manifest question whether there might or might not be forbearance upon this question of endowments? And then, sir, in asking an answer, or proposing to give an answer in these circumstances, how can it be said that any one is driven or concussed? Why should not every man have his own views, and why should not every one who feels that he needs more time, follow his own convictions, and decline to give his answer? But if we believe the time is come, and the Assembly ready, why should we not bring forward the proposition? Do not let it be said we are unnecessarily and unreasonably driving a decision, after time has been given for full consideration. And then let this be considered: I can conceive it might not have been necessary to answer the question so distinctly. The thing might have gone on upon the general presumption that we were not intending to drive our United Presbyterian friends from the position they hold, but that we were prepared to settle the matter on the principle that if there was to be union, there must be forbearance on

the point. Who has made it necessary for us to answer that question? (Hear, hear.) They have made it necessary who, however conscientiously, have proclaimed it abroad that they regard it as absolutely indispensable to union that there must be entire agreement between us and the United Presbyterians, to the effect that it is lawful for the magistrate to endow the Church. (Applause.) I say men are the best judges of their own course of conduct, but I am entitled to judge whether their conduct is consistent, and I say their proper course was to have brought in a motion four years ago, setting forth that they were willing to go into negotiations for union, only on the understanding that there should be no forbearance on the question of the lawfulness of endowments. If it had been brought to that point then, does not everybody see that the United Presbyterians would have said, "We are very glad you have told us; we reciprocate your feelings, but we cannot go into negotiations, because it would tend to mislead our people, and damage our reputation altogether." What would have been the effect upon us if the United Presbyterians had said, "We are willing to go into negotiations, if it come out that you are prepared, along with us, to deny the lawfulness of endowments?" We would have said, "There is no use putting ourselves to the labour and trouble on these terms." And so it is now. It is said we are going to divide the Church. I don't know what division is going to happen. I say we have simply to answer the question, and we have had time to justify us in calling upon ourselves to answer it. We are not going to drive those who do not agree to this into any course they disapprove of. We are proposing no practical step. The United Presbyterians said, "We are willing to take the decision of your Assembly as sufficient ground to act upon; we think it time to give a decision, and if that decision is favourable, we shall go on." That does not bring us into any position among ourselves which deserves to be stigmatised by the name of division. There is no reason why there should not be henceforth as much free interplay and interchange of feeling and conviction upon that subject among us as there has been already.

And now, sir, upon the question itself. All that I am anxious for is, that all the members of this House should decide simply under a sense of the responsibility attaching to the subject. A friend—in regard to whom I do not know in the least what vote he is to give—said to me the other day,—“I shall be very sorry if the negotiations go off, for we shall not have the same chance for a hundred years that we have now.” Now, sir, I tell you plainly, that if you adopt Dr Begg's motion, the negotiations go off. There is no use feigning or creating a doubt upon that point. That is certain. (Loud applause.) It may be right they should go off; it may be right the views should prevail of those who say—and they are perfectly entitled to say it—there ought to be no union that implies forbearance on the question of the lawfulness of endowments. Only let the Assembly feel that the question for it is to weigh the reasons for them saying so.

And now, Moderator, I shall not revive my unfortunate *status questionis*, but I shall try to join issue with Dr Gibson in the form he put it, and see if that will help the matter. He put it on the issue of the lawfulness of separation. I tried to show that this question of the lawfulness of endowments was outside the proper constitution and Confession

of the Church. Now, I ask you—every man who is to vote this day—if, in God's providence, we and the United Presbyterians were ministers in the same Church to-day—is it a ground of separation, that, having nothing to do with the State at the present moment, some of us should think that, although the civil magistrate is bound to do everything that Christ requires of him, Christ does not require him to endow the Church, but has laid down principles sufficient to exclude his doing so? (Applause.)

Dr GIBSON.—I must be allowed to speak to order. I do not put it on the ground of endowments.

Dr RAINY.—The lawfulness of endowments?

Dr GIBSON.—Not the lawfulness of endowments. I put it on the broad ground not only of the doctrine of the civil magistrate, but on the broad ground of a principle of forbearance that would allow us to make the terms of the whole Confession a matter of forbearance.

Dr RAINY.—I am in the judgment of the Assembly whether, on the whole substance of the case, I have not made a perfectly fair appeal upon that subject; whether, the case being so, we would be entitled to make a separation. Would a separation be lawful? (Cheers.)

In regard to the answer made to what I said upon the Confession, it was proposed to prove, by citing the texts appended to one of the paragraphs of the Confession, that we are giving up its doctrine when we propose this practical forbearance. Texts, Moderator! Dr Cunningham's name has been mentioned; I remember how he used to say it was the principle of confessions to tie no man to the exegesis of texts; that there was but one text interpreted in the Confession of Faith, and in his opinion it would have been better if they had not interpreted it. (Laughter and applause.) Is it not a manifest concession to my argument when a party is reduced to meet it on such a ground as that? (Cheers.) It refutes itself.

And now I have to say one or two words, in the first place, with regard to the state of the question as to what our United Presbyterian brethren have come to; and, in the next place, with regard to Dr Begg's motion.

As to what the United Presbyterians have come to, our friend and father, Dr Wood, says he believes they have not come to anything substantial, because though they have acknowledged the duty of the civil magistrate as civil magistrate, yet they say, at the same time, "like any other Christian man;"—implying that room is made for a theory upon that subject really inconsistent with the apparent admission that was made, because they added, "like any other Christian man." Now, I am not going to answer that myself, by I shall read two paragraphs from "Gillespie's Hundred and Eleven Propositions." He says:—

"68. Whereas the Christian magistrate doth wholly devote himself to the promoting of the gospel and kingdom of Christ, and doth direct and bend all the might and strength of his authority to that end; this proceedeth not from the nature of his office or function, which is common to him with the infidel magistrate, but from the influence of his common Christian calling into his particular vocation.

"69. For every member of the Church (and so also the faithful and godly magistrate) ought to refer and order his particular vocation, faculty, ability, power, and honour to this end, that the kingdom of

Christ may be propagated and promoted, and the true religion be cherished and defended ; so that the advancement of the gospel, and of all the ordinances of the gospel, is indeed the end of the godly magistrate, not of a magistrate simply ; or (if ye will rather) it is not the end of the office itself, but of him who doth execute the same piously." (Applause.)

I have said that Dr Begg's motion is manifestly a motion proposed on this ground, stated in the speeches of almost every one who supported it—most conscientiously, I have no doubt, and it is entitled to every respect—that there ought to be no union that implies forbearance on this point. Well, I understand that ; I understand, also, that some will vote for the motion who do not go that length. But, Moderator, we hear strange opinions now-a-days. Dr Begg comes forward—and he takes a very high position indeed—Dr Begg comes forward as the champion and conservator of our Church of Scotland Presbyterianism. He takes a tone that calls us to respect his position as the champion of our common Presbyterianism—or Church of Scotland Presbyterianism. And if that be so, he lays down a ground for his motion, and for objecting to our proceeding to answer the question we have now to answer, that is just flat and sheer and simple Congregationalism, and nothing else—(laughter, applause, and cries of "No, no")—the identical Congregationalism that was defended in the Westminster Assembly by the Independents, who were confuted by the Presbyterians. I maintain it, and I pledge myself to prove, that in saying that on the question of doctrine this Assembly is not to lead off—that it is out of our province to answer such a question as this, or to ripen the minds of our Presbyteries and people by debating and deciding upon it—he lays down the position of Congregationalism. I say it is revolutionary, and it tends to the subversion of our constitutional principles, and to the overthrow of the authority of our General Assemblies. (Loud applause.)

Dr BEGG.—Dr Rainy knows perfectly well that the ground I stated and maintained was, that this matter could not be disposed of by us—that it was beyond the competency of the Assembly, like many other matters to which reference was made. I referred, for example, to a resolution of this Assembly to return to the communion of the Established Church, and I challenge Dr Rainy to say that it is within the competency of the Assembly.

Dr RAINY.—And I challenge Dr Begg to say that it is a matter for any Presbytery to originate by way of overture. (Prolonged cheering.)

Dr BEGG.—I say it is perfectly competent for a Presbytery to do so. (Laughter, and cries of "Oh ! oh !")

Dr RAINY.—I wish the Assembly to have regard to this, that our Confession of Faith and all our Standards were adopted by the Assembly without sending them down to a single Presbytery—(applause)—and further, that our Standards were adopted piecemeal. Those men adopted the common-sense principle of attending to one thing at a time—(laughter)—and they did not decide upon the Larger Catechism, and the Shorter Catechism, and the Directory for Public Worship, and the Confession of Faith, all in a bunch. (Laughter.) They did not leave it to the immense confusion that would have arisen if every part and corner of every question of the immense programme were to be thrown all at once in upon men's minds. (Laughter.) They had too much sense and too much Presbyterianism. (Great and prolonged cheering.)

The Assembly then divided, when the first vote was taken between Dr Begg's motion and Mr Nixon's, and the latter was carried by 90 against 61.

Dr BEGG then rose and said that he intended most cordially to vote for Mr Nixon's motion as against Dr Rainy's.

The division was next taken between Mr Nixon's motion and Dr Rainy's, when there voted,—

For Dr Rainy's motion,	346
For Mr Nixon's motion,	120
	<hr/>
Majority,	226

This announcement, as made by the Clerk, was received with great applause.

Dr BEGG then rose and said—Moderator, I wish to lay on the table of the General Assembly the following protest :—“ We, the subscribers, for ourselves and on behalf of all others who may adhere, do hereby protest against the resolution now adopted by this Assembly, and that on the following among other grounds,—1. Because the resolution so adopted implies an abandonment and subversion of an admittedly constitutional principle of the Free Church of Scotland ; 2. Because the resolution, as adopted, is *ultra vires* of this Assembly. For these and other reasons we protest that we and all other office-bearers and members of the Church shall not be committed by the said resolution, to any action that may be taken thereupon, and shall be at liberty to oppose all such action by every competent means.—(Signed) Jas. Begg, D.D. ; Peter Denny ; John Forbes, D.D. ; James Galbraith ; Jas. Gibson, D.D. ; Robt. M'Corkle, minister ; James J. Wood, D.D. ; D. Thorburn, M.A. ; Robt. Gault, minister ; Wm. Balfour, minister ; John Macmillan, elder ; Patrick Borrowman, minister ; A. Macbride, minister ; John Irvine, elder ; D. Crichton, elder ; Alexander Cameron, minister ; D. Macdonald, elder ; William Moffat, minister.

Sir HENRY W. MONCREIFF said that when a dissent was given in, with reasons, it was entered in the record, and a committee was appointed to answer them. But he wanted to know from the Assembly what he was to do with this protest.

Mr WOOD, Elie—Is it competent for a member of this Court to protest ?

Mr NIXON intimated his dissent from the resolution.

Dr GIBSON—There is a dissent and reasons. I would not find it necessary to give it in were it not that it is now matter of discussion, as I apprehend, whether or not that protest will be put on the record, but there can be no doubt about the dissent, and therefore I give it in. Dr Gibson then read a dissent, which was, for the most part, in the same words as Dr Begg's protest.

RESIGNATION OF MEMBERS OF UNION COMMITTEE.

Dr BEGG said it would have given him much satisfaction to remain on the committee, but for the deliverance to which the Assembly had now come. He had taken great pains in that committee, as would be admitted, he believed, by its members, but he declined to have now any more connexion with it.

Mr NIXON said he wished it to be observed that the reason for which he had entered his dissent was because he believed that the resolution of the Assembly was fitted to hinder rather than to promote union.

Dr WOOD—I feel that the decision the Assembly has come to has altogether altered my position as connected with the committee. I feel I can be of no more use there, and I beg respectfully to resign my seat in the committee.

Captain SHEPHERD, and afterwards Mr MAIN, also resigned their appointments as members of the union committee.

Dr CANDLISH—The dissent will, of course, be entered into the ordinary record, with the reasons and answers also. The question about the protest, which is in the same words as the dissent, might raise more difficulty. I submit that, in the meantime, it ought to be kept *in retentis*.

Sir HENRY MONCREIFF—It may be kept *in retentis*, and put in a separate record.

Mr SAWERS, Gargunnock—What is the meaning of that? Is it to come before the Assembly again?

Dr GIBSON—The question raised by Mr Sawers is a very important one.

Sir HENRY MONCREIFF—I understand that I note in the minute that a protest was given in, which is to be kept *in retentis*.

Dr BEGG—I have no wish to hurry the Assembly with a deliverance upon it. It is too solemn a matter for that.

The MODERATOR—What is the next business?

Sir HENRY W. MONCREIFF—There is no other business.

The Assembly then adjourned at half-past five o'clock.

EVENING SEDERUNT.

The Assembly met this evening at half-past seven — Dr Roxburgh, Moderator. The body of the hall, where the members sit, (after the exciting discussion on Union,) was not, at the outset, so well filled as usual on occasion of the Foreign Missions Report; but the public and other galleries were fully occupied.

FOREIGN MISSIONS.

Dr DUFF, who gave in the report, (No. VII.,) was received with great applause. He proceeded to say that he did not wonder, after the protracted and exhausting discussions in the Assembly, that so few comparatively of the members were present this evening; he rather wondered that there were so many. But he might mention, for the sake of his younger brethren, that his own principle had always been, that if he had an important message given him to deliver, the number to whom he had to deliver it was nothing to him. It might be over 20,000, as had once happened to him in North Wales, or it might be only one, as had once happened to him at a station in travelling along the Ganges, when he went through a regular service for that one, who afterwards, when he came to Calcutta, became a zealous and liberal member of the Free Church. The bulk of the report arises from excess of matter, and not from ornamentation. This indicates that our missionaries are really at work; and, what is more, are doing a great work, a varied work, an ex-

ceedingly miscellaneous work ; and that too of a kind, the fruits of which eternity alone will show. (Applause.) There are materials in this report which might well occupy us the whole night. I shall leave certain urgent matters, such as those which concern the Widows' and Orphans' Fund, buildings in missionary fields, and increased allowances to European and native agents, to some of the lay brethren who may address you this evening. There are, however, some points in regard to which I crave the indulgence of the House while making a few remarks. Before proceeding further, I may state that since this report was written and approved of by the committee, a matter has arisen which concerns myself personally, and in regard to which I am bound to say something. In consequence of the action of this Assembly the other day, I have felt it to be nearly impossible to attempt, with any degree of satisfaction, to carry on the whole work of the convenership of the committee at the same time with that of a new office to which the Assembly has been pleased to appoint me. The fact is, that the Foreign Missions Committee is now charged with a weight of responsibility which the Church at large does not well understand. The missions have become so extensive, and the questions that often arise are so difficult, so delicate, and so complicated, that it taxes the energy of any man properly to attend to them. I have all along proceeded on this principle, that we must take up at once every matter which is referred to us, and deal with it promptly. On the whole, I may say that there has been no ordinary reference made to us from the foreign field which has lain over beyond a month without being decided. Within the month the answer has been usually given ; and it has often happened that it has been despatched within a fortnight by the next mail. We have no arrears, notwithstanding the vast amount of business brought before the committee. (Applause.) In consequence of the heavy nature of the work, and the necessity of promptly attending to it, I felt that it would be perfectly impossible for me, with my very fluctuating and exceedingly precarious state of health, to undertake the whole work of two important offices ; and in these circumstances it has been suggested by the Foreign Missions Committee that two of the brethren most competent for the task should be associated with me as vice-conveners—Rev. Dr Murray Mitchell and Dr Thomas Smith—they being willing to give every assistance in their power, and thus conferring a great obligation on the Church. (Cheers.)

At the last Assembly it was my very painful lot to be obliged to state that after two years of endeavour, the committee had failed in obtaining the offer, even of a single student, to go out to the foreign mission field either in Africa or India. It has been common to state that the proceedings of last Assembly ended in nothing ; but that was not the case. Some time after the rising of the Assembly, offers of service came to the committee from the colonial field. We were very thankful for the spirit which prompted these offers ; but after considering the matter, it was not deemed expedient to avail ourselves of them. Subsequent to that, several young men from our colleges expressed their willingness to repair to the foreign field. After due inquiry, their offer was accepted as candidates for the missionary office. They would be ready to go forth in the course of next year if the means were available for sending them. Since this report was written, another gentleman has come forward and offered himself for immediate service. We knew of his name before, but there were

difficulties in his way. These, however, have been overcome. He is from Aberdeen; and, in fact, that city is becoming a great missionary institute itself. We have been accustomed to think of it as the cold Granite City; but I was telling Dr Brown that out of the granite we get gold; and something more precious than gold has been coming out of the Aberdeen granite—the living water which is to carry healing and life to the ends of the earth. Mr Rae, the gentleman's name, is a fourth-year's student; his services were accepted by the committee the day previous to the meeting of the Assembly, and he was appointed to the very important station of Madras, and will be ready to go out in a few months, followed, I have no doubt, by the prayers and best wishes of the fathers and brethren. (Applause.)

I have said four or five men will, next year, be sent forth if means are available for the purpose. This brings me to the money department. I know this is an intolerable subject with many, who are apt to think of it as a lowering and degrading theme. We cannot, however, do without money. I am not here to-night in the character of a murmurer or complainer; I am rather disposed to pity and compassionate those whose hearts will not allow them to part with their substance for the promotion of the cause of Christ. In refusing us these means they are not robbing us so much as their own souls and the souls of their fellow-creatures, who otherwise might be benefited by giving of their substance to this holy cause. We have, however, reason to be thankful that since last year some progress has been made in the better direction. Some may remember the appalling statement that was made of the exceeding littleness of what was contributed by the members of the Church in general for the cause of Christ. I cannot say that there has been a great improvement, but we ought to be thankful that there has been some. Four years ago the sum received for the missions was about the lowest ebb. Since then there has been every year a gradual increase, so that this year on the regular contributions there is an addition, as compared with what it was four years ago, of more than of £1000. (Applause.) Upwards of 400 congregations have increased more or less this year. The increase has been so much greater than the decrease on the other 300, that there is on the whole a net increase of about £400. There has, therefore, been progress in the right direction; and my own impression is, that had it not been for the trials and difficulties connected with the past year, commercially and otherwise, the increase would have been greater still. Had the other congregations not decreased, but proportionally increased, we would have had the means for sending forth four or five new men to the mission field. We could not send them forth, although ready to-morrow, from this cause. My belief, however, is, that there is a feeling rising now in the Church that will not tolerate the spectacle of five men willing to go forth, and yet unable to do so, for the want of the material means of support. I do not think that this will be any longer tolerated in this Church. While congregations have decreased, others have increased in the amount of their givings remarkably; and this has occurred in Edinburgh, as well as in other places. An elaborate statement has been prepared on this subject, which may yet be sent down to Presbyteries for their information. I will, however, simply remark here, that it is to be remembered that, generally speaking, there is reason to be thankful that the tide is fairly turned, and that it is now beginning to run in the right direction.

Still the contributions are miserably small. It had been shown in the Moderator's opening address that only 10d. a year on an average was contributed by each member of the Church. That was not one farthing a week; only four-fifths of a farthing every week contributed for the world's evangelisation! I cannot understand how many communicants can lie down and sleep with such a burden hanging over them undischarged, as their proper duty towards this fund. At the same time, there is a readiness to give on the part of many that ought to be matter of rejoicing and of thanksgiving to God. The effort to which I made allusion last year in connexion with South Africa, in the Transkei territory, in regard to which several ladies in Edinburgh came forward as volunteers, is one remarkable example of this. That was a spontaneous effort to raise £1000, in order to plant two new mission stations there. I am authorised by these ladies to state that this has been actually completed—(applause)—and we now only want the proper men to send forth. I really do not know whether I am warranted in giving the names of those who have taken the most active part in the business. My own impression is, that they ought to be made known. The apostle Paul made known the names of the females as well as of the men who helped on the cause of the gospel in his day. Dr Duff here mentioned the names of Mrs Main, Mrs Cleghorn, and Lady Emma Campbell, and warmly thanked them, as well as the ladies throughout the country who so kindly collected for them. He then continued—I am rather disposed, on the whole, to take a sunshiny view of the matter. Things, in the main, wear a rather bright appearance, and I am very hopeful. Last year, owing to a diminution in the extraordinary revenue, we were threatened with a deficit of £1600 on the financial year. But I rejoice to say that, although there was no public appeal, but only a private appeal to a few friends in Edinburgh, Glasgow, and several other places, yet within a short time the whole £1600 were subscribed, so that we were able to terminate the year, not with a deficit, but with a small surplus. (Applause.) This is creditable to the liberality of the gentlemen who thus came forward, and is besides a very hopeful symptom for the future. As another illustration of prompt liberality, I may state that the other day a venerable clergyman from the Highlands called on me, and told me that he had a scheme which he wished to carry out, as it would greatly benefit the poor Highlander. Approving highly of the scheme, I asked him what it would cost to carry it out, and he replied about £100 a year. A day or two afterwards I happened to meet three members of our Church, two of them members of this House, all of whom approved of it when I explained it to them. One of them at once said, "I will give £20;" the second said he would give a similar sum; and the third one also promised £20; and what was more, he added, "You can hold me responsible for the completion of the whole sum." I cannot help referring to facts of that nature, as they are some of those hopeful symptoms which tend to cheer and encourage us. They show us that there is something precious underneath the outer surface, and enable us to judge of the mines that have not yet been opened, and which are reserved for great occasions when the cause of the Lord is to be advanced. (Applause.) The last gentleman to whom I have alluded happened to mention to me an anecdote which much struck me, and with which I was greatly pleased. He said he was calling on a friend one day, and

that he found him in a doleful mood. When he noticed the state in which his friend was, he said, "My dear sir, what you want is copious bleeding." His friend expressed surprise at the statement, and said that he was so much reduced that he could not stand bleeding. The gentleman's answer to this was, "It is not the bleeding of the body you require, but the bleeding of the money-chest. (Laughter and applause.) If you only knew the blessed privilege of emptying this out, and devoting the contents to the cause and service of Christ, it would restore your health." (Renewed laughter and applause.) This gentleman also made this further remark, with which I was so much struck that I cannot help repeating it. He said, "This Free Church of ours has done wonders in the way of benefiting the health of many of us, and of even prolonging the life of not a few, for it has given us high and noble motives for work; and we work now with double pleasure, inasmuch as we do so, not for ourselves, but for Christ." (Applause.)

While referring to this matter of giving, I cannot help alluding to the Systematic Beneficence Society, which I hope is in favour with all present. It is based on the grand principle of holding ourselves responsible to God for all that we have, and that it is our bounden duty to devote a large portion of the income which He may be pleased to give us directly to His cause and for His glory. It does seem strange that the great principle which lies at the root of the Beneficence Society—the grand New Testament principle—the principle of being stewards of God's bounties—should be looked upon by many in these days as if it were a novelty. Why, it is a principle which is at least three thousand years old. We have the grandest exemplification of it in the history of David in First Chronicles xxix. In that chapter we are told how David poured out of his treasury, gold, and silver, and precious stones; and when he had set the example which he did, he appealed to his nobles, and they liberally responded. Example is better than precept, and what took place in David's case was just what might have been expected. What was even more remarkable than the liberality displayed, was the willingness of heart which was shown. In fact, the whole principle of the Systematic Beneficence Society was expounded and acted out by David. If David's principle was acted upon now, instead of the subscriptions from the whole of our members to the Foreign Missions being four-fifths of a farthing for a week, it would be four-fifths of a shilling, and would not stop even there. On one occasion, when in Calcutta, I received a letter from an officer who had served in the Scinde campaign. He had received between three thousand and four thousand rupees as his share of the prize money. I had only seen him once, when he happened to be passing through Calcutta. Having taken him to visit our institution, he was greatly struck with it. In that letter he sent what he called a tithe of his prize money, amounting to upwards of three hundred rupees, as a thank-offering to God. I thanked him warmly for his liberality; and in doing so happened to refer to the 29th chapter of Chronicles and 14th verse, stating that it was a blessed thing to have the means of giving, but that it was still more blessed when God was graciously pleased to give us the disposition to part with these means. Some two or three weeks afterwards I received a second letter from the same officer, containing the whole of the rupees which he had received for his prize money, accompanied with the remark, "I had often read that chapter

and that passage, but it had never struck me in that light before ; and I thank God for putting it into my heart to do as I have done." (Cheers.) He then desired me to acknowledge the receipt of the sum in a particular newspaper, but stated that I was not to mention his name, but to say that it was from 1 Chronicles xxix. 14. (Renewed cheers.) That was not all. When the time arrived that he was able to retire upon a pension, instead of coming home, as many do, to indulge themselves in luxurious ease and idleness, he entered as a volunteer in the service of his Lord, and became a practical missionary in India, for which his knowledge of the vernacular and his other qualifications eminently qualified him ; and I can assure this Assembly that it was a noble work that he rendered. (Cheers.) He is, alas ! no more ; but " his works do follow him." I look upon this as one of those notable facts which fill our minds with rejoicing, and call forth feelings of thankfulness as well as furnish grounds of encouragement.

In connexion with this subject, I may mention another remarkable circumstance. Many years ago, happening to be in South Wales, I made the acquaintance of a Welsh gentleman. He was then a landed proprietor, living in his own mansion, and in very comfortable circumstances. He had been before carrying on an extensive business in a large town. By the death of a relative he had unexpectedly come into possession of this property. After considering whether he should retire from business, he made up his mind that he should still continue to carry it on, though no longer for himself, but for Christ. I could not help being struck with the gleesomeness of a holy mind which lighted up his countenance when he said, " I never knew before what real happiness was. Formerly I wrought as a master to earn a livelihood for myself ; but now I am carrying on the same work as diligently as if for myself, and even more so ; but it is now for Christ, and every halfpenny of profit is handed over to the treasury of the Lord ; and I feel that the smile of my Saviour rests upon me." (Cheers.) I think that is an example worthy of being imitated.

Dr Duff here referred to what might be done in the way of circulating the *Record* and other missionary publications, such as the *Illustrated Missionary News*, *Dr Grundemann's new Missionary Atlas*, &c. ; and stated that through means of them the missionary spirit of the Church might be greatly increased. He also showed how, if proper steps were taken in the case of the Sabbath-schools, the interest of the young might be more powerfully enlisted in the missionary cause, and, for this end, particularly recommended the employment of a well-qualified Sabbath-school agent, who might traverse the country, holding conferences with teachers, helping to organise new schools, and pointing out improved methods of conducting them.

Dr Duff then continued—There are pressing calls from every department of our mission field for more labourers and more means of supporting labourers—natives as well as Europeans. We have not the means. What are we then to do ? It is for this Church, represented in this Assembly, to say what we are to do. There are three ways open to us. First, there is the stationary way—will that do ? God forbid. What is the law of life in Christianity ? It is that of growth, it is that of development, it is that of expansion, it is that of progress. Missionary enterprise in a Church ought always to be stretching itself out according to

this law of development and progress. I believe that is the immutable law, the law which is as absolute in the economy of grace as the law of gravitation is in the economy of nature. Will you tell me, then, that our duty is to remain stationary? Will you tell me that you are to contravene that law, to go in opposition to that law? Can you contravene the law of gravitation with impunity? No; neither can you contravene this law of the economy of grace with impunity either. If you put it upon us as a duty to remain stationary, then that is to contravene the law of progress. You are asking us to do something which, I venture to say, no angel nor archangel could listen to for a moment, which no body of gracious men, with souls regenerate, ought for a moment to make themselves responsible for. It is unknown in the economy of nature, this law of stationariness; it is unknown equally in the economy of grace. And for any Church of Christ to act on a law that is unknown in the economy of nature or the economy of grace, must speedily prove fatal to her well-being.

Then, instead of the stationary, there is the fluctuating or alternating way. That is, you may resolve to go on as you have been doing during the past years, fluctuating, sometimes up, sometimes down, sometimes backwards, sometimes forwards. There is something purely intolerable in this way also. When we have gone forward a step, apparently according to the laws of progress—when we have been encouraged to plant certain stations and appoint certain agencies—then next year we are called upon to recede from the point we had attained to from a failure of the means of support. Then what is imposed upon the Foreign Missions Committee? The painful duty—I was going to say the unspeakably disgraceful duty—of reducing our stations, of dismembering them, of withdrawing men from the mission-field or preventing others going into it. The discouragement thus produced is so great that even if the means were soon increased, labourers may not readily be found; or, if found, what if the means of support are again soon diminished? Such an alternating process is emphatically to contravene the law of progress in the kingdom of grace.

A third way of it is neither the stationary nor the fluctuating, but the steadily retrogressive movement. And if we make up our minds to that, then farewell to the prosperity of the Church itself, both at home and abroad. God may be provoked to withdraw His presence and blessing altogether from a Church which has so egregiously violated the fundamental law of His kingdom. For I hold the law of onward progress to be a law of the spiritual economy of the Church, as much as any commandment in the Decalogue is a law in the moral economy of the world.

This, therefore, is a most serious business; and what are we to do? There must be increase, or there must be backgoing and withdrawing of the blessing. I referred already to the smallness of the average contribution for the greatest cause on earth, that of the world's evangelisation, namely, four-fifths of a farthing a week from every member of this Church. Yet, how strange! when I look abroad, I see communicants—members of the Church—spending ten times, twenty times that amount upon what is unnecessary, and not only unnecessary, but what is noxious. I speak from memory when I say that I have known even poor Highlanders spend sixpence or a shilling a week for snuff and tobacco, and

twice that amount, it may be, to purchase that abominable, nauseous thing called whisky. (Laughter.) I know you will excuse me for plainness upon this subject. (Hear, hear.) Some persons turn round and say, These poor creatures—how can you press them to give a penny a week, or more, for foreign missions? I say, I would not only press them, I would squeeze them, if I could, to give up snuff, tobacco, and whisky, since they might become, by so doing, better, and wiser, and more gracious men; yea, were they, instead of wasting their substance on noxious narcotics and such like, to cast the gift of their money into the Christian treasury they might have better health and prolonged life for it. (Hear, hear.) It is terrible, some say, to deprive these poor creatures of the only luxury they have. Precious luxury! this snuff, tobacco, and whisky! I ask, Did our great forefathers know anything about these luxuries? Did the great forefathers of the Highlanders know anything about snuff, tobacco, or even whisky? I venture to say they knew nothing about any of them. Never. Did those old Greeks who fought at Thermopylæ, Marathon, and Salamis, and baffled and routed the countless hosts of the Persian monarch, know anything about snuff or tobacco at all? (Hear, hear, and laughter.) Did those ancient Caledonians who braved the Roman legions, and refused to yield homage to the masters of the world? (Hear.) No, they knew nothing about snuff, or tobacco, or whisky. And were those ancients who repelled the Persian hosts and Roman legions, inferior in mental or physical energy to the degenerate Greeks of the present time—I will not say degenerate Highlanders, because I hope they are not?—(laughter)—assuredly not. Then, I have no hesitation in appealing to the partakers of snuff, tobacco, and whisky, and earnestly soliciting them to give up what serves only to pollute the nostrils, injure the stomach, and taint the breath till it smells like the fishy fume which drove Asmodeus from “Media post to Egypt, there fast bound.” (Renewed laughter.) When the millions are perishing for lack of knowledge, I would press them to give up these poor idols of misnamed luxury, and apply their means to a better and holier purpose. (Hear, hear.)

Again I repeat it, from every mission field, and every quarter of it, there are calls for an increase of men and means. God's providence, God's grace is opening up new ways to us. What does this signify? It signifies that God, in His providence, has gone greatly ahead of us, that He is vastly before us with the intimations of His providence, that He is inviting and alluring us to go forward. By not going forward we are, as it were, resisting the influence of God's Holy Spirit. How can we expect this influence to be poured out upon us when there are palpable calls which we do not and will not meet? Let me refer to a case, which reached me the other day, as an illustration of what I mean. It is reported in a newspaper which has reached me from Nagpore, and I have every reason to believe that the report is substantially correct, and it is something very affecting, very impressive. The statement, as given in the newspaper forwarded to me by Mr Cooper, refers to a district in the eastern division of Nagpore, called Chuttisghur, or “thirty-six forts,” when translated into English. The inhabitants, some forty or fifty years ago, were upwards of half a million in number, and are now greatly more. The proprietors are Hindus of the higher castes, while the Brahmans are all-powerful there,—the bulk of the population being Chumars or workers in leather, who are

of a low caste, though chiefly employed as agriculturists, who were very much tyrannised over by those whom they had been taught to regard as a sort of demi-gods. At last one of their own number professed to be sent by Heaven as a deliverer. A small number of followers gathered around him, to whom he expounded his opinions, and they became enthusiastic admirers. But this leader said to himself, I will get more influence over my followers if, like other holy men, I retire to the gloomy forests among the hills. I will go there for six months, and fast, meditate, and pray; in short, I will act out the grand law of Hindu asceticism, and after that I will return with my revelation to them—with my message from heaven. During his absence, his followers began to expound what he had been telling them to the rest of the people, and before the end of six months great expectations were raised. Upwards of 100,000 people assembled in a spacious plain near the village of Girode, watching for the advent of this new prophet; and when the day at last arrived that he came down from the wooded heights behind, and appeared among them, they were satisfied that he was sent as a prophet from heaven. He told them that his message to them was, that they were to throw off the oppressive Brahmanical yoke, to fling away their idols, to give up their superstitious worship, and were to worship the only one God, who created all things, and to worship Him not by outward material symbols, but to worship Him by meditating upon Him and praying to Him. The report is that thousands, if not tens of thousands, obeyed the summons. And if it turn out to be so, does it not seem to be a very remarkable movement in Providence? Does it not look like a challenge from the heathen world to come forth and give them the pure gospel instead of the idols which, for long ages, they and their fathers had worshipped? (Applause.) The only other case I know at all similar to this is that of the Sandwich Islands, where, as you may remember, before a missionary had landed there at all, under a feeling of the intolerable restraints of the idolatrous *tabu* system they were suffering from, the people had resolved to demolish their temples and burn their idols, and at that very time our American brethren were preparing a mission to send to them, and in the course of the next forty years the Sandwich Islands had become at once civilised and Christianised. (Hear, hear.) I know not what others' feelings may be with regard to the case I have mentioned, but I wrote at once, on my own responsibility, to Mr Cooper and Dr Wilson, suggesting that they should at once send some competent parties, European or native, or both, to see what this movement really was, and to report upon it. Why not drop any regular work to watch such a movement as this? If I were in Calcutta I would not hesitate to throw aside any ordinary routine work and go thither to inquire, and if it turned out to be anything like the representation now given, what results might we not hope to witness! This region is within the proper circle of our missions, and there is no other mission but our own within reach of it. Therefore it is flung, as it were, by the providence of God upon our Church to see and know whether we ought not to go and teach these idol-renouncing people the principles of a soul-saving Christianity. As to the means, I think I see before me to-night some half-dozen laymen who would be found ready to say, send you the men, we will give the money. (Applause.)

That is a singular and extraordinary case; but in all the missions

there is a pressing call for additional men and additional means of support. We must remember that up to a certain point, when the number of converts shall be so increased as to make them self-sustaining, the needful amount of support will be in proportion to the success and prosperity of any mission. And thus there must be an increasing expenditure alike in means and men. The question has been asked, then, in connexion with the present state of things, seeing that we are nearly stationary for so long a time, Has the spirit of missions been declining amongst us—is it degenerating? Dear friends, my own impression is, that it is not declining. The way it strikes my own mind is this. There is a feebleness and strengthlessness where the cause is the decay of old age, and there is a feebleness and strengthlessness of immaturity—of infancy. We have never got as yet to the full strength of maturity. We see the feebleness of the sapling, and also the feebleness of the great old oak which has been there for centuries, but which is now rotten in the heart, and the branches falling down. Now, our feebleness is not that of the old decaying oak, with the canker-worm at the heart, but the feebleness of the sapling. The missionary spirit is like the young plant that is growing; if it live and thrive it must grow and expand and gain strength. My own belief is, that at this moment the missionary spirit and feeling is still merely in its infancy, and that therefore we have some reason to hope that by God's blessing upon us it may grow up to fulness, maturity, and strength. (Hear.) Then blessed be the Church which shall exemplify it; blessed be the labours of those who shall most fully exhibit it.

With regard to another practical question which has been raised, Why are so few coming forward to offer their services for the mission field? Our excellent friend, Dr Andrew Thomson, has made a remarkable statement upon this subject as to the want of young men. And, as the address has been published, I wish a copy of it were in the hands of every member of this Church. (Hear.) I have been greatly struck, since coming home from India, with the cankerworm that seems to be at the root of many of the institutions of our country, and the spirit that is abroad on the subject of religion. These fearful libels upon Christianity, there can be no doubt, are not without their effect upon the hearts and spirits of our young men in detaining them not only from the work of the Church at home, but also from its work abroad. Then there is no denying that of late years the minds of men have been more or less agitated about the *modes* of carrying on missions. My own belief is that if the spirit of grace were poured out more largely, if there were more earnest prayer, there would be little debate about the various modes. Will any man tell me that the same mode of agriculture is adapted to the deep rich soil of Bengal as is suitable to the hard stony soil of the north of Scotland? The thing is an absurdity. And so with regard to the modes of conducting missions; they must be varied and adapted to the circumstances of every case. Again, the objection has been made that we have in our mission schools a number of teachers who are not Christians. Well, on that question I am ready to meet any man in public discussion, though I am not going to trouble the Assembly with the discussion. But in the province of Bengal, for instance, where you find only four or five out of the hundred able to read, what is the use of the Bible among those who are not able to read a single

word? Surely, in such circumstances, it would be an unspeakable blessing, as we have often said, if we could only get these people taught simply to read. For that purpose, if you would teach them, you must first employ the only kind of men available, seeking to superinduce better teachers afterwards. But what is the state of things even in this country as compared with India? I venture to say that, in the 4000 or 5000 schools in Scotland, you cannot aver that the 4000 or 5000 teachers are all truly Christian men. And if not, then they are not one whit more Christian in the true and proper sense of that term, than the men employed in India. (Hear, hear.) I think that is a fair way of putting it. May I not go further? If you have such men in your schools here, then I say we are better off in India; for there is not one of our own mission schools in India that has not at least one Christian man in charge, and giving instruction in it every day—(hear, hear)—so that you see our schools are more Christian than many of the schools in this country. Then another thing connected with this matter is, that of those persons who come to us not Christians, having to hear the doctrines of the Christian religion constantly taught in school, they often become Christians, and most valuable Christian teachers. As regards American missions, to which reference has often been made, in that of Jaffna in Ceylon no fewer than 132 have become Christians; and at Ahmednugger a number of the most efficient native pastors and other labourers have become converts in the same way; and it has been the same, more or less, in all other missions.

But without enlarging, as I well might, on this particular topic, there is another thing often objected to, and it is this—that the number of conversions connected with our missions is smaller in proportion than in the other missions in India. I deny the fact; I am prepared to deny it, and to prove that it is not the case. We have many things to take into account, as honest and logical men—men endowed with force of reason and common sense. Are you to put a mission about a generation old on the same footing with the mission that is four or five generations old? Why, one of the missions in Southern India was established at the beginning of last century—so that it is now a century and a half old—and Tinnevely, of which so much has been heard, was commenced by Mr Schwartz a hundred years ago. That is one element to be considered; and another is, the number of men employed. Will you tell me that one or two men labouring here in Edinburgh, can be expected to produce the same results as ten or twenty men? The thing is monstrous and preposterous; but it has often been put in this ridiculous shape—the number of our converts and conversions pitted against all the converts in all the missions in India! It is as if you took one of the most energetic men of this town, Mr Wilson of the Barclay Church, and showed me his congregation, and said—“Ah, but what are all these compared with the hundreds of thousands all over Scotland?” And there is another element to be taken into account. Those who have been in India will tell you the difference between what are called the aboriginal tribes of India and the great Brahmanical family. These aboriginal tribes are unsophisticated; they have no hereditary priesthood, and nothing of the strict nature of caste; they are a down-trodden race; and when the missionaries speak kindly to them, they look upon it as wonderful condescension. I have seen in Tinnevely, years ago, that some-

times a thousand would come in for instruction ; but I found also that sometimes a thousand would go back again, or, perhaps, join the Papists, which is just back again to idolatry, for the Papists are as bad as idolaters. These people are at first generally untaught, and there is extreme liability, for some time, to disorder and confusion ; but the day is coming when it will be found that there is a power in the manner in which we conduct our missions which will save them from some, at least, of those sad results, which even already are beginning to appear in others. What are men not having their minds thoroughly cultivated to make of many parts of the Bible, if they become its authoritative expounders ? They take up their own notions of it, and they will evolve as many doctrines as their own notions. I warn all who are anxious and expectant against the evils that may arise from this source. Even now there are sects and schisms among those people. I could point to one Church, where about a thousand of them have withdrawn from its membership, and have set up a species of caste system, and have manifested various extravagances ; amongst other things, a prejudice against everything European or British, and a notion that the Sabbath has been changed from the seventh day of the week to the first day by us British ; and as they think they are wiser than us, they have restored the old day, and observe it instead of the first. Cases of this kind show there are rocks ahead. Therefore, dear friends, let me say it is not fair to give heed to loose and unguarded statements that are thrown afloat upon society by men ignorant of the circumstances of the case. But I will go farther, and look at the total number of converts connected with Protestant missions in India. Dr Mullens, the secretary to the London Missionary Society, published, in 1851, a volume of statistics in regard to the results of all the missions to India. Ten years afterwards he published another volume ; and I ask you to compare the one with the other, and see what has been the rate of increase of converts in the missions in India during that period. I say that, if you take the increase of the aggregate of all Indian missions during that period, you bring out the arithmetical result that our missions have been blessed of God to a fourfold or fivefold degree as compared with other missions in India. (Applause.) It comes to this, that for thirty-seven per cent. the average increase of all the missions in India, we have something like two hundred and ninety-one per cent. during the same period. I think these are facts that ought to be regarded as causes of gratitude to the God of providence and grace.

Coming to the outside world, it has become fashionable now-a-days among the classes who reckon themselves the leaders of public opinion, towering in their own estimation, over us like the Himalayas above mole-hills—though they are the veriest slaves of prejudice and idolatry worse than the prejudices and idolatries of India—it has become fashionable to say that all missions have been failures. That is the slang current in the higher circles of the literary and scientific world, and you meet with echoes of it in all directions. Even according to their own usual way of estimating cause and effect, it is preposterous and foolish to draw such a conclusion. I think when we say there are 150,000 Protestant native Christians already in India, the Christian Church may be amply satisfied ; but these men often talk and write as if they expected that we were to go forth and perform wonders and miracles, though, strange to say, the real miracles

they despise and deny. According to them, it should be a question of agency and work to be done—agency proportional to the result to be expected. What then is the proportion now? Why, in China, with a population of between 300,000,000 or 400,000,000, we have a hundred missionaries—as if we had one man of God labouring for the evangelisation of the whole of Scotland, and that too, on the supposition that the entire population was Antichristian and idolatrous. The disproportion is not now so great in India; but the number of really effective labourers there is not more than would be four or five for all Scotland and its Islands. It is not easy to produce an impression of this utter disproportion between the means and the end by stating this in an abstract way; therefore I have often wished the whole General Assembly could be passed over by telegram into India, and made to permeate it from end to end, and they would come back with new views and feelings. I have sometimes felt when traversing the valley of the Ganges and other vast Indian plains, with their teeming populations, and comparing these with the utter inadequacy of the agency brought to bear upon them, that the attempt to evangelise them looked very much like the attempt, by means of a few twinkling tapers, to turn the cloudy darkness of midnight into the meridian brightness of noonday—with a few spades to level the Alps, the Apennines, the Andes, and the Himalayas—with a few buckets to drain the Atlantic and the Pacific—with a few pocketknives to cut down the primeval forests of the Norwegian hills—with a few squibs and crackers to assail the impregnable fortress of Gibraltar—or with a net of gossamer to capture the crocodile of the Nile or the huge leviathan of the northern ocean. (Applause.) To the oppressed natural feelings, the attempt looked almost like idiocy run mad; like absurdity in hysterics; like illusion dancing in maddest frenzy; like the unsubstantial dream or vision of the dreamer who has dreamed he has been dreaming. (Laughter.) I cannot help expressing myself in this strong way; it is the expression of the sentiments forced upon my soul by traversing these vast regions; I cannot help it, though I do not expect any one heartily to sympathise with me. Of course, with the smallest means, yea, without any means at all, God Almighty may achieve wonders; but what right have men to complain of the want of mighty results, if the means they choose to employ be preposterously inadequate to the production of them?

But then the question returns, and we must admit that the expectations even of God's people half a century ago have not been fully realised; and one cause, so far as I can learn since my return, has been that the expectations then entertained with regard to the work and results of missions were really extravagant and not warranted by Scripture. We know how missions started. They started upon the assumption that by the gradual dissemination of Christian truth the whole world was to lapse, as it were, without scarcely knowing it, into something like a millennium. These expectations I hold to be unscriptural, and those who entertained them are now disappointed. But the fault is with themselves. Through taking the true scriptural view of missions, I have come to learn that the doctrine of election is a reality. We all profess to be Calvinists, that is, in reality, Paulists; we all profess to believe in the doctrine of election; but in the case of missions we have not an abstract dogma only,—we have the living palpable embodied reality before our very eyes. When

in America, I was often asked the question how a missionary could go on with heart and courage in the midst of so much opposition, so much disappointment, so much apparent failure. My answer uniformly was, Not merely because of the promise of God sustaining us, but, in the case of some of us, because of this precious doctrine of election sustaining us. If it had not been for the doctrine of election, I should long ago have felt discouraged and distressed. But if it be God's way, unfathomable though the mystery be, and if it be in accordance with His infinite wisdom, who am I that I should be dissatisfied? Who am I that I should murmur and complain against the decree of the omniscient and omnipotent God? No, fathers and brethren, let us look at it in a scriptural light, and my own individual impression has long been, that during this present dispensation (which we all believe, I trust—I fondly hope—is to terminate in the period of millennial glory) the law will be throughout the earth, as Christ himself has laid it down, that of the “many called and the few chosen”—that there will be in every realm of the earth but a little flock in the midst of the nominal professional Christianity and the great mass of the unbelieving world. Such is the view I have been led to take of the gospel cause and its missions; and taking this view, I believe that, as regards the future, we are all doing a great work over the whole earth now. Already a goodly number of converts in almost all lands has been called, chosen, and converted; but there is a greater work still in the way of preparation for mightier results even during this present dispensation. We are all sowing the good seed of the kingdom to a prodigious extent; and as seed-sowers, I hold that, proportionally to our agency, there are no missions in the world at this moment that have a grander future than the missions of the Free Church. (Applause.)

All Christians now admit, and indeed from the word of revelation nothing can be more certain, than that the time is coming when the true saving knowledge of God in Christ shall fill the whole earth. How, then, is this grand consummation to be realised? Chiefly, if not solely, as most Christians believe, through the universal diffusion of the word of life, brought home with power by the agency of the Spirit of God. That agency has hitherto ordinarily operated in slow, gradual, and limited ways. At times, indeed, this ordinary method has been broken in upon by extraordinary visitations of the Spirit of grace and power—more or less extensive as to the outspreading, more or less intensive as to degree. But the prophetic Scriptures abundantly indicate that towards the close of the present dispensation, when the time of the latter-day glory draws near, and as a fitting preparation for it, these extraordinary visitations of the Spirit will increase in number, in frequency, and in extent. And that is tantamount to saying, that religious awakenings and revivals will become more numerous, rapid, extensive, and frequent over all the earth, until that which is now regarded as extraordinary, simply from its rarity and infrequency, shall become the ordinary procedure in ushering in a new and more exalted economy. In figures, images, and metaphors, representing suddenness of spiritual birth, rapidity, expansion and stateliness of spiritual growth, and an overflowing copiousness of spiritual influences—figures, images, and metaphors, more graphic and bold than the uninspired mind of man could venture to suggest—the prophets pour out their vivid utterances on this momentous theme. Here the majority of Christians usually pause; and truly grateful and soothing to the mere

natural feelings it would be to be able to pause at this bright side of the picture. But what if there be another—a dark, a distressing, an alarming side of it? If there is, are we not bound, as honest interpreters of God's word and God's workings in providence, calmly to look at it too, whether men will hear, or whether they forbear? It would be delightful to think that, amid the outpourings of God's Spirit and mighty revivals, heralding the halcyon millennial days, all is to be quietness and softness, gentleness and peace. But what if truth and holiness and Scripture forbid us to indulge the expectation?

Divinely ordained it was that the imperial lord of the then known habitable world—all unconscious of the significancy of his own act—should have been led to close the gates of the temple of Janus for the second time in seven hundred years, and then proclaim that universal peace had commenced its reign, at the very time when He, the Lord of Glory, the Creator of all worlds, the true Prince of Peace, condescended to appear in His humiliation, as the Infant of Days, in the manger cradle of Bethlehem. And of the same event beautifully has the sublimest of uninspired men thus sung:—

“ But peaceful was the night
Wherein the Prince of Light
His reign of peace upon the earth begun.
No war or battle sound
Was heard the world around ;
The idle spear and shield were high uphung ;
The hooked chariot stood
Unstained with hostile blood ;
The trumpet spake not to the armed throng,
And kings sat still with awful eye,
As if they surely knew their sovereign Lord was nigh.”

But, oh ! how different the description given of Him, and of the scenes that shall present themselves when He comes forth, as King and Conqueror, to put down all principality, dominion, and power, and make His enemies His footstool, in order to set up the kingdom that shall never be shaken ! Inspiration itself seems, as it were, to stagger and sink under exhaustion in devising images fit to portray the scenes of destruction and horror then to be fearfully realised. It is, indeed, an overwhelming thought that such scenes should be associated with outpourings of the Spirit and mighty revivals at all—that the Almighty should hasten on the advent of the latter-day glory by the rapid and simultaneous removal of wicked men, as well as by the rapid and simultaneous conversion of multitudes in all lands. But has it not been so, in principle and in fact, from the beginning? Has not the destruction of the wicked uniformly kept pace with the deliverance of the righteous, and that, too, in order to effectuate their complete deliverance? And is it not so, just because—contrary to the judgment of a speculative, unbelieving world—He is the sin-avenging as well as the sin-pardoning God? However awful, therefore, the thought, there is nothing new, nothing staggering, either as to principle or fact, in the assertion, that the accelerated destruction, not less than the accelerated conversion of men, is to hasten on the day when there shall be nothing to hurt or destroy in God's holy mountain. Indeed, I scarcely know a more extraordinary or unscriptural illusion, than that which leads to and cherishes the expectation, that the Church of Christ, now in warfare and sore travail, is somehow or other—like a

vessel carried along by the trade-wind breezes, with streamers flying and sails full set, scarcely requiring oversight or adjustment by night or by day—to glide gently and noiselessly, and by almost imperceptible degrees, into its blissful haven of millennial glory. I merely express the overpowering conviction of my own understanding and heart, after much and long study of Scripture on this very subject, when I say, that if the Church of Christ, during the middle and transition passage from her present militant state of toil and suffering to her future triumphant state of millennial repose, is to have her sunny showers and springtides of gladness, she may expect to have her hurricanes and her horrors too; yea, that amid the outpourings of the Spirit's grace in glorious revivals, and in very proportion to their extent and plentitude, may be expected a war and turmoil of physical and moral elements, such as the world has never yet seen.

Here let it be specially noted that I say nothing of the personal coming as connected with the supposed personal reign of our adorable Redeemer on earth, in which many of the most godly amongst us firmly believe. On that particular point I at once candidly and frankly declare that I have never yet been able to obtain sufficient light to warrant me to pronounce with peremptory dogmatism for or against. Respecting it I simply keep my judgment in suspense, my decision in abeyance, waiting patiently for further light. All I now declare, and mean to maintain, is, that a season of storm, and tempest, and penal retribution on long-resisting foes, immediately antecedent to the millennium, does not necessarily involve the personal coming in judgment, in order to the personal reign of our blessed Lord on earth. He has other ways of effectually coming in judgment besides that. In an Assembly like the present, to attempt to illustrate a theme like this would be as perfect a work of supererogation as to convey cargoes of ice to the Polar regions, or of palm trees to the coral strand of India, or of sand to the deserts of Arabia. I need only refer to the waters of the universal deluge, the plagues and pestilences of Egypt, the returning billows of the Red Sea, the fire and brimstone of Sodom and Gomorrah, the capture of Babylon by the Persian monarch, and the capture and destruction of Jerusalem by the Roman armies. In all these and other cases, the Lord effectually came down for the removal of His enemies and the deliverance of His own people. And in these and a hundred other ways He may come down again; for He—the Infinite and Omnipotent one—is not, like man, limited in His resources and agencies, whether of mercy or of judgment. But that down He shall come, in some way or other, as the Sovereign and righteous Judge, to shake terribly the earth and rid it for ever of His own and His people's implacable foes, seems altogether certain; unless, with the unbeliever and the scoffer, we pronounce the Bible a fable, and sacred justice the name for a mocking nullity.

That, in the latter days, there will be more copious outpourings of God's Holy Spirit upon all flesh than ever before witnessed, and that, in consequence, the number of conversions will be accelerated and multiplied beyond all former experience, is what I rejoice to believe, because I believe there is ample warrant for this in the Word of God. But in that blessed Word of infallible authority I find no warrant for believing that, even under the mighty outpourings of the Spirit in the latter days of the present dispensation, all will be truly converted unto God. It

never has been so in any age or clime. Never, never have all the dwellers in any district, city, or nation, become new creatures in Christ Jesus, or regenerate by the power of the Holy Ghost. Never, never has it been so with any revival, even the greatest. Pentecost itself, with its prodigies of miracle and of grace, left the vast majority of the inhabitants of Jerusalem and Judea still unconverted; and by their rejection of the offered mercy, in the face of such wonders of grace and power, their hearts only became the more hardened, and themselves vessels better fitted for destruction in the day of the Lord's fierce anger. Nor have we any reason to believe that it will be otherwise; yea, we have every scriptural reason to believe that it will be substantially the same, though on a scale of stupendously greater magnitude, in winding up the present dispensation, which the Pentecostal effusion and the violent up-breaking of the Jewish polity in the destruction of Jerusalem so marvellously introduced, with their strangely mingled profusion of mercy and judgment. Through the larger outpourings of the Spirit, to be confidently expected in all lands, the solemn exhortation of Jehovah to all nations is, "Be wise now, therefore, O ye kings; be instructed, ye judges of the earth. Kiss the Son"—through Him be reconciled to your offended God—"kiss the Son, lest He be angry, and ye perish from the way, when His wrath is kindled but a little." But, alas, alas! the same Word of inspiration emphatically assures us, that, in spite of all such offers of mercy and warnings of judgment, multitudes, blindly infatuated through sin, will not kiss the Son—will not repent and be reconciled to God; multitudes, therefore, who must perish from the way; multitudes, whom the Son, in His wrath, will break with a rod of iron, and dash in pieces like a potter's vessel. In further confirmation of the same awful truth, let us remember, and seriously lay it to heart, that it is amid the outpouring of the seven vials, or seven last plagues, in which is filled up the wrath of God, that we find again and again repeated the doleful interpolation—"And men gnawed their tongues for pain, and blasphemed the God of heaven because of their pains and their sores, but repented not of their deeds, to give him glory." Yea, and when the terrible hail of the seventh or very last vial of judgment falls upon men out of heaven, it is expressly added that they still "blasphemed God because of the plague of the hail; for the plague thereof was exceeding great." And it is towards the close of these awful retributive visitations, and in order to wind up the whole, that the Apocalyptic Seer beheld in vision the righteous Judge himself come forth, "clothed in a vesture dipped in blood. And out of his mouth goeth a sharp sword, that with it he should smite the nations; and he shall rule them with a rod of iron; and he treadeth the winepress of the fierceness and wrath of Almighty God." Now, let all this symbolical imagery be interpreted as any one may, one thing is clear beyond all question, that it is the imagery, not of love, but of anger—not of mercy, but of sore judgment—not of salvation, but of the exterminating destruction of unrelenting and incorrigible foes.

In order, in some measure, to account for so desperate a state of things in the very midst of the outpourings of the Spirit's grace, the Holy Seer tells us that it was under the sixth vial of judgment that he beheld three unclean spirits like frogs, which were the spirits of devils, or rather demons, come out of the mouth of the dragon, the beast, and the false prophet, and

go forth unto the kings of the earth and of the whole world, to gather them to the battle of the great day of God Almighty. These, according to some of the ablest interpreters, are the spirits or demons of infidelity, the Papacy, and priestcraft, as recently exhibited in new and unwonted ways in some of the Protestant Churches. But, while viewed generically, this may be the truth, considering the number of their allies and auxiliaries, the name of each may well be called legion. Synchronously with these direful intimations, the warning cry is heard, "Woe to the inhabitants of the earth and of the sea; for the devil is come down unto you, having great wrath, because he knoweth he hath but a short time." Under the plottings and promptings of so potent and malignant an adversary, with his confederate hosts, what can be expected but "havoc and ruin and spoil?" Finding that his time is short, and finding also that his cause threatens to become daily more and more desperate by the constantly increasing secession of myriads from his standard, under the awakening, converting, and reviving influences of the Spirit's grace, poured out in previously unexampled measure on the inhabitants of all lands, he naturally is filled with more violent indignation and wrath. And in the very frenzy and madness of his wrath may he excite and let loose evil feelings and evil passions long pent up, under various repressive influences, in the hearts of hundreds of millions, yea, and exasperate them into tenfold fury. The demon of faction, rampant and burning, alike in the ranks of a proud aristocracy and a fierce democracy, may be seen sharpening his keenest weapons. The demon of party spirit may empty his quiver of its arrows, steeped in the gall and wormwood of bitterest recrimination. The demon of carnal policy may be busied in reconciling the Herods and the Pilates of religious indifferentism, and in urging them to hurl their envenomed shafts against the friends and advocates of a living energetic evangelism. The demon of persecution may set his iron car into more rapid motion, ruthlessly to tread down, as of late in Spain and elsewhere, the children of God, who glory in living by faith and not by sight; and when the infliction of physical pains and penalties, torture or death, by the stake or the scaffold, may be beyond his reach, pour upon them increasing torrents of groundless ridicule and reproach, with ingeniously subtle and lacerating misrepresentations of motive, intention, and design, so as for a season effectually to silence the witnesses for the truth. The demon of worldly ambition, unsettledness, and unrest, as in the case of some of the continental nations at this moment, may whet his glittering sword, and be preparing to wield, with relentless energy, his newly invented and more terrible enginery of destruction. The demon of civil and military despotism, proclaiming his empire to be peace, yet engirdled with his martial array of heartless sycophants, may sound his trumpet—exulting in the enforced collapse of the eagle pinions, by which the patriot and the brave had made sure to mount into the glow and sunshine of blissful liberty; and proclaiming the reign of a repressive absolutism over body, soul, and spirit, in his dark and silent dominions to be eternal. The demon of intellectual pride may "grin horribly a ghastly smile," as he vents his sarcasms and his scorn on the reputed influenza of saintly fanaticism, and the epidemic of nauseated religious excitement. The demon of a depraved imagination may, in his revolving kaleidoscope, profess to exhibit the phantasmagoria of revival scenes for the jest of the silly witting and the crackling

laugh and amusement of the giddy throng of this world's gay triflers. The demon of a superstitious Pharisaic ritualism may strive, in the way of ludicrous mimicry, to revive the varied mechanisms and manipulations of a lifeless, heartless, mediæval formalism; and thereby provoke Christian converts from the multitudinous heathenisms of India and China, New Zealand and Kaffraria, in pity and compassion, to send over native missionaries to reclaim our Oxford Romanisers, and their host of peacock-like, fantastically-arrayed followers, to the pure faith of primitive apostolic Christianity. The demon of rationalism, irrationally spurning the awards of enlightened reason, may scout the plenary inspiration of God's holy Word, and treat with contemptuous scorn the cumulative evidences of a supernatural revelation; yea, and may perilously venture to attenuate into a filmy myth, or, soaring to a still bolder climax of blasphemy, may even dare to degrade into a charlatan or an impostor the Holy One and the Blessed, of whom a celebrated leader of modern unbelief, in one of his lucid moments, could truly exclaim—"Yes, if the life and death of Socrates were those of a sage, the life and death of Jesus were those of a God!" The demon of a hydra-headed infidelity may amuse itself with the old heathenish folly of tracing man's original to some obscure self-developing molecule or atom up through an endless series of animated beings, till it reach the noble aristocracy of monkeys and gorillas—the immediate ancestry of man; and vent his ebullitions of impotent and impious ire against the efficacy of prayer and the over-rulings of Divine Providence, disdainfully repudiating the right or power of the great Creator to interfere in any way with His own works or laws—thus openly daring the Omnipotent to arms! The demon of a greedy, grasping, all-devouring covetousness—scornfully trampling, under sundry plausible pretences of philanthropy and public accommodation, alike on God's holy Sabbaths and the inalienable heaven-bestowed rights of humanity, in his frantic speed anyhow to get rich, but often checkmated in his wildly selfish career, by the increase of light and life and principle which religious revival invariably dispenses all around—may rudely break in upon the very songs of Zion with the discordant wail, "Oh that it were gone! that we might buy and sell, and get gain." The demon of the intensely secular and anti-spiritual portion of the public press, (for I rejoice that there is a better portion of it rendering noble service to the cause of truth and godliness,) self-enthroned as umpire amid surging and conflicting elements, may, like the "Anarch old," by his judgments without principle, and his cross decisions without consistency, worse embroil the fray. The demon of anarchy, or utter lawlessness, and the grosser passions may unbar the gates of all restraint, and let loose hordes of vices and dissipations, chicaneries and frauds, rapacities and cruelties, which, if not arrested in mid-volley, may sweep over the earth with the desolating violence of a tropical tornado—turning its Londons, Parises, Viennas, and other monster capitals and great cities into so many Sodoms and Gomorrahs, ripe for the swift-descending judgments of Him who is to tread the winepress of the fierceness and wrath of Almighty God. Then there will be a shaking of the political earth, and a rending of the political heavens, over all the world. The suns of imperial, regal, and democratic rule, that disowned the supremacy of the Sun of Righteousness, will be darkened. The moons of humanly devised ecclesiastical polities will be turned into blood. The

firmaments of power being shaken, all stars of inferior authority in Church and State will fall from their respective spheres, like figs that are shaken by the gales of autumn. "The sea and the waves roaring"—in other words, the multitudes of the people, smitten with the pestilence of infidelity towards God, and of insubordination towards all lawfully constituted authorities, rising in ungovernable rage, and spreading devastation and terror all around. "Every mountain and every island will be cast into the depths of the sea,"—every great state and every petty state merged into the chaos of democratic turbulence and revolutionary madness—with distress of nations and perplexity—men's hearts failing them for fear, and for looking after the things that are coming upon the earth.

Then, amid the upbreak—the clash, the collision—and frightful uproar of shattered and dissolving organisations, sacred and civil, political and ecclesiastical, with their cumbrous burden of misbegotten manners, habits, customs, fashions, rules, observances, ritualisms, canons, and laws, which have been confusedly accumulating for two or three thousand years, will the grand antagonist systems to the cause of truth and righteousness—Polytheism and Pantheism, Atheism and Materialism, Mohammedanism and Romanism, and every surviving form of Paganism—finally perish from off this earth and from under these heavens, amid scenes that are vividly portrayed in Apocalyptic vision—tremendous scenes of conflagration and slaughter—the bare thought of which is enough to make one's ears to tingle, and one's blood to curdle in the veins. Then, too, will be heard the last wild panic cry of the kings of the earth, and the great men and the rich men, and the chief captains and the mighty men, attempting, in their despair, to hide themselves in the dens and in the rocks of the mountains, and saying to the mountains and the rocks, "Fall on us, and hide us from the face of Him that sitteth upon the throne, and from the wrath of the Lamb; for the day of His wrath is come, and who will be able to stand?" But, while all who refuse to kiss the Son, though pathetically exhorted to do so, and assured of a hearty welcome by the willing heralds of the Spirit of Holiness, themselves the fruits of mighty awakenings and revivals in all lands;—while all who refuse to kiss the Son shall thus, before His enkindled wrath, miserably perish from the way; blessed, thrice blessed, shall they all be who put their trust in Him. As regards them, His voice, even amid the outpoured vials of descending judgments upon the impenitent and the wicked, will be found that of the Beloved, who, as He cometh "leaping upon the mountains and skipping upon the hills," may be heard saying, "Rise up, my love, my fair one, and come away. Lo, the winter is past, the rain is over and gone; the flowers appear in the earth; the time of the singing of birds is come; and the voice of the turtle is heard in the land. Rise up, my love, my fair one, and come away." Then will the Redeemed Church, His spouse—eagerly responsive to the voice of the heavenly Bridegroom—speedily come forth from her long dark night of weary toil and suffering, fierce battle and bloody martyrdom, chastely arrayed in pure white bridal robes and queenly majesty, into the palace of the king—the virgins, her companions, following her through the enchanting scenes and gladsome bowers of the new heavens and the new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness. And then, oh, then! amid hallelujahs and choral symphonies, louder and more ecstatic far than when the "sons of the morning," by their songs, did cele-

brate the rise of the first heavens and the first earth out of the wide, wasteful womb of the chaotic deep—will she, caught up into the arms and wrapt in the embrace of her Beloved—“the chief among ten thousand, and altogether lovely”—sweetly enter into her rest, and, as preparatory to the heaven of eternal glory, joyously keep jubilee a thousand years! Hallelujah! O Lord Jesus, when shall it be? Hasten it in its time. Amen, yea, and amen! (Great applause.)

Dr MURRAY MITCHELL said he had much pleasure in introducing to the Assembly the Rev. Mr Wardrop Gardiner of Puna. Mr Gardiner had not personally appeared in any Assembly before this, but his name was familiar to every member of the House. He had himself been associated with Mr Gardiner for several years; and although, in Mr Gardiner's presence, he would refrain from the expression of much that in other circumstances he would have said, he must at all events state his conviction that a more single-hearted, faithful, and devoted labourer there was not in the mission field. Mr Gardiner had rendered most valuable service in the important mission at Puna, where he had laboured without intermission for twelve years. Dr Murray only regretted that Mr Gardiner did not feel himself able to address the Assembly at any length. Dr Murray then said that, before sitting down, he would advert in a sentence to a personal matter—one already briefly mentioned by Dr Duff. When first asked to accept the office of vice-convenership he had thought he might do so; but further consideration had convinced him it was not desirable. He need not detain the House with any statement of the reasons; no one would suppose that unwillingness to work for the Foreign Missions was one of them. Unofficially, and as a member of Committee, he would do everything in his power to advance the cause of the missions. To a missionary compelled to quit the high places of the field it was a blessed consolation—indeed a necessity—to labour in the work at home up to the limit of his opportunities and powers; and he could truly say—as, he doubted not, the other returned missionaries could also say—if I forget thee, O India, let my right hand forget her cunning; let my tongue cleave to the roof of my mouth, if I forbear to plead thy cause, O India, and do not esteem it one of my chiefest joys still to labour in the holy work to which I had fondly hoped my whole life was consecrated.

Mr WARDROP GARDINER then gave a brief account of missionary work at Puna.

Professor DOUGLAS then moved:—

“That the General Assembly approve of the report of the Committee on Foreign Missions, and record their cordial thanks to the committee, and especially to the convener.

“The Assembly record their hearty thankfulness to God for that His good hand hath been for good upon the missionaries of the Church, preserving them all in life, and in a fair measure of health, during the year under report. They commend them afresh, with their families, their fellow-labourers, and the converts of the mission, to the goodness and the grace of their Heavenly Father. They gladly welcome amongst them Mr J. Wardrop Gardiner, of Puna, who has recently returned to this country in accordance with the furlough regulations, and who has this evening addressed the Assembly.

“While the Assembly regret that the committee had not been able

up to the time when the report was printed, to make any appointments of new missionaries during the year, they rejoice that five students, at various stages of their theological studies in the several colleges of the Church, have been accepted as candidates for mission work, and that since the report was printed, Mr George Rae, who is about to be licensed as a probationer of this Church, has been appointed as a missionary to Madras, and they commend these students and Mr Rae to the earnest prayers of the Church, that they may be endowed with needful gifts and graces for the honourable and important office to which they aspire.

“In view of the greatly increased expense of living in India, and the consequent probability that a permanent augmentation of the allowances to the missionaries will be imperatively required; in view also very specially of the increasing success of the missions by God’s blessing, demanding an increased and constantly increasing number of European and native labourers, the Assembly earnestly urge upon all members of the Church the necessity of enlarging their contributions to the scheme; and also solicit special donations to the Widows’ and Orphans’ Fund, and to the proposed Building Fund for mission premises and missionaries’ houses in India and Africa, with the view of setting free for its proper use that portion of the ordinary funds which is now of necessity appropriated to these purposes.

“The Assembly express their great satisfaction at the very varied operations carried on at all the mission stations, while the educational operations, which in the earlier period of the mission were its almost exclusive work, are prosecuted as vigorously and more extensively than ever. While they rejoice that they have 10,000 of the male and female youth of Asia and Africa under thoroughly Christian instruction in their several seminaries, they would especially at this time express their interest in the operations recently commenced amongst the Waralis, the Gonds, and other aboriginal tribes in India, and amongst the inhabitants of the Transkei territory in Africa, and commend the labourers in these fields, as well as those in the older missions, to the special interest and prayers of the members of the Church.

“In respect of Dr Duff’s appointment by this Assembly to the Professorial Chair of Evangelistic Theology, and considering the extreme desirableness of retaining his services as convener of the committee, while it is manifestly impossible that one man can, without assistance, discharge the duties of both these important offices, the Assembly resolve to reappoint Dr Duff as convener of the committee, and to associate with him Dr Thomas Smith, whom they resolve to appoint as vice-convener.”

Dr R. BUCHANAN seconded the motion, and in doing so assured Mr Gardiner of the pleasure it afforded the Assembly to welcome him, and of their hope that he might soon be so far restored to health as to be able to return to his labours at Puna.

Mr WM. KIDSTON, elder, said—Having been appointed representative elder from the Presbytery of Caffraria, South Africa, perhaps I may crave the indulgence of the House in making a very few remarks in reference to the report on missions now under consideration. (Hear, hear.) I should like to have said something of the wrongs of Africa, or interested you with some details of trials and difficulties of its early explorers and missionaries. The recent discoveries of Dr Livingston in

Central Africa, whose face, alas! we shall see no more, have tended to increase an interest in Africa. There is scarcely any doubt that South Africa will at no distant period be the abode of a great people. A change has taken place recently, and there has been a considerable influx of emigration, many of them from Scotland. In India, a somewhat civilised country, missionaries wisely began with their high education scheme, and only more recently have directed their attention in the way of oral teaching and preaching. In South Africa there was, on the contrary, little civilisation, and the missionaries commenced with oral teaching and preaching, and more recently they have endeavoured to establish a complete educational and industrial institution. The Fingoes in South Africa have great desire for education, and are willing to adopt improvements in agriculture. From what I have learned I would be disposed to place the Fingoes next to the white man, both as to mind and body; in equal circumstances a Fingoe boy is quite a match for a respectable youth of European origin, in the acquisition of knowledge, whether classical or mechanical, notwithstanding the Saxon superiority in energy of character.

The Free Church Mission is becoming every year of more and more interest; and if the Church at home supports it as it requires and deserves, they will do a great work for that country. I am glad to notice that since Dr Duff became convener, we are getting more interesting information from Africa. We have then in connexion with our Foreign Mission Scheme, first, the vast and populous regions of benighted India; and, second, British Caffraria, a most interesting section of unhappy Africa. When we think of a small island like Briton being invested with control over so vast a country as India, we can scarcely avoid the conclusion that it was the intention of Providence that we should send them the gospel. We can scarcely examine this interesting report without seeking to have the mind of Christ, who, when He beheld the multitudes, had compassion on them, because they were as sheep without a shepherd. (Hear, hear.) Dr Duff has spoken to-night of what he calls the unpalatable and degrading subject of asking money. But I think the members of our Church, when they are giving their subscriptions to the Foreign Mission Fund, should ask themselves, Is this all that I can give for one year to the great cause of missions to the heathen? I agree with the report that the experience of the past year emphatically demonstrates how desirable it is that our great mission stations in India and Africa should depend less on legacies and donations, and far more on the steady and growing liberality of the congregations. (Hear, hear.) I am glad that our friend Mr Braidwood has been exerting himself to induce congregations to form associations for collecting the Foreign Mission Fund in cases where these have not been already established. I would like to say a word on a topic referred to by Dr Duff—I mean the circulation of the *Missionary Record*. This is a subject worthy of the attention of the House. Its circulation, instead of thirty thousand, should be sixty thousand. Various plans are suggested for this purpose; but whatever plan is adopted, it ought to be prosecuted with vigour. The *Record* is much improved since Dr Duff took an interest in it, and a regular perusal of it is well calculated to promote all our schemes. Dr Stewart, before he went out last to Lovedale, made an effort to obtain a collection of books for the library at the seminary, in which he only partially succeeded. I

am happy to announce to-night that the late Rev. Alexander Anderson of the Free Gaelic Church, Rothesay, has bequeathed his library to the Lovedale Institution. There are about 460 volumes, besides maps and globes, and they will be forwarded to their destination without expense. The Scripture command to us is, "Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature." How are we obeying that command? I was examining a book to-day, which contains the statistics of all the societies of every denomination throughout the world which are directly engaged in the work of evangelisation; and even looking at the aggregate result, we are still constrained to say that it is yet but the day of small things.

"Rari nantes in gurgite vasto."

At the same rate of progress we have witnessed hitherto it would take thousands of years before the world would be converted; but more rapid processes may be at hand to gladden our sights and hearts—nations may be born in a day. We have the promise that the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the glory of God, as the waters cover the channels of the sea. And the spots on the map which mark our mission stations may be like the big drops before the plentiful shower that shall water the nations that are perishing with thirst. (Applause.)

Colonel DAVIDSON and Dr J. J. BROWN, Aberdeen, also briefly supported the motion, which was then carried; and the Assembly adjourned shortly after eleven o'clock till Saturday at ten.

SATURDAY, JUNE 1.

ENGLISH PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH.

The Assembly met in conference to-day at ten o'clock, for the purpose of receiving a deputation from the English Presbyterian Church.

The deputation consisted of the Rev. J. C. Paterson of Manchester, Moderator of the Synod; Rev. W. M'Caw, Manchester; Rev. James Paterson, Liverpool; Rev. John Matheson, Hampstead, London; Rev. John G. Wright, Southampton—ministers; Thomas Matheson, Esq., George B. Bruce, Esq., George Duncan, Esq., Rev. William Swanson—elders. Professor Lorimer was also present, and took his place amongst the members of the deputation.

The Rev. Mr BRAIDWOOD, late of Madras, had great pleasure in introducing the deputies from the English Presbyterian Church. There were, he said, many weighty reasons why the Free Church should give to any deputation from the English Presbyterian Church the most cordial reception; and he especially directed attention to the handsome manner in which members of that Church in Liverpool and Manchester had responded to the appeal rendered necessary some years ago, when a sum of £5000 was required to repair the devastations which occurred to their mission premises in Bengal by those calamitous storms peculiar to India. Of that sum the fifth had been contributed by their English friends. Their English Presbyterian friends had also laid them under obligations in other matters.

Mr J. C. PATERSON then addressed the Assembly. He said that the

deputies on that occasion appeared in their midst not for the purpose of making complimentary speeches, but for the purpose of presenting the claims of the Church which they represented on the sympathy and assistance of the Free Church in the arduous and responsible labours in which she was at present engaged in the sister country. We are, he said, your very near kinsmen. There is no Church in the world that stands in the same relation to your Church as the English Presbyterian Church. I do not know any other that have declared as we have done that we adopt the principles of the Free Church of Scotland. (Applause.) We have done that by actual deed ; and for the resolution which we adopted to that effect, we suffered very considerably in the loss of Church property ; so that I take leave to say that we have as fully, as faithfully, and as boldly maintained and exhibited the distinctive principles of the Free Church of Scotland as if we had been an integral portion of yourselves. (Renewed applause.) I take leave to say that our Presbyterianism is as distinctly and clearly defined as is that of the Free Church of Scotland. (Continued applause.) Mr Paterson also mentioned that a large proportion of their ministers belonged to the Free Church ; and then thanked the Assembly for the £2000 which had been realised by the collection which had been made last year on behalf of the Church extension movement in England of their own Church. He also thanked the Assembly for the aid which that movement had received in consequence of the able and efficient ministers which, through the labours of Mr Hope of Wamphray, they had sent to them to assist in the organisation and formation of new stations and organisations in different parts of England. Having given thanks for these things, Mr Paterson said he would now state some of the things which he wanted the Free Church to do for them. We do not, he said, want any aid for our own existing congregations. We are perfectly equal to do that work ourselves. We can provide stipends for all the ministers of these congregations. We do not want you to do the whole work of Presbyterian Church extension in England. We do our fair share of that work ; and what we want is simply that you should help us to extend Presbyterianism in England. We think that a responsibility lies on you to do so. We think you will recognise our claims not merely for sympathy, but for positive help. (Hear, hear, and applause.) We desire to extend Presbyterianism in England ; and we do so on two grounds. In the first place, on account of the present condition of the English Church. No man can inquire into the state of things in the prelatie Church of England without seeing that there are two forces there contending for the mastery—that we have superstition manifesting itself in the Ritualistic movement ; and be you sure of this, that the movement is not one merely on the outside—that it is merely superficial. (Hear, hear.) It is not a mere question of vestments. This movement has gone down deep to the dogmatic roots ; and each of these vestments, in the eyes of the men using them, represents distinct dogmas, and dogmas that are sheer flat Popery. (Hear, hear.) Then we have the men of the Broad Church, who believe simply in the intellect, and who produce nothing except barren speculations. These two forces are contending for the mastery ; and beyond all question superstition will overcome infidelity. Man has a conscience, and must face death with its fears ; and this gives to superstition a power which the mere dogmas of infidelity do not possess. There

is no doubt in the Church of England at this moment a very large number of good Evangelical ministers; but they are sheltering themselves behind the Constitution of the Church, and behind the question of an Establishment. They will not come forth to the light of day, and rally behind some leader who will teach them what they are to do, and how they are to prepare for contending with these two forces. But while this is their attitude, the other two forces have great leaders. No man can read those most interesting and extraordinary essays on the "Church and the World," without seeing that Dr Pusey is not merely the recognised public leader of the whole, to whom all men look—the head of the party to whom all have recourse for advice and counsel—but that he is the secret spiritual director of all who cherish these views—of all who are taking part in this Ritualistic movement. (Hear, hear.) There is nothing that can be done effectually in England at present to meet this state of things but by a Church thoroughly organised, and having divine institutions, for the work cannot be done by outward organisations outside the Church. We want you then to help us to set up a Presbyterian Church in England on a large scale, in order to do something, at least, to counteract the evil effects and influences of the teaching of the Broad party within the Church of England on the one hand, and of the Ritualists on the other. Another reason why we ask your help to set up a Presbyterian Church in England larger than we have at present, is that there are many thousands of Scotchmen who come to England every year. I do not know the number, but it is a very large one. In order to show the extent of this, Mr Paterson read an extract from a letter he had received from Staleybridge, near Manchester, to the effect that within the last three weeks no fewer than seventy Scotchmen had come to a place at a little distance, where they were expected to settle permanently. There, continued Mr Paterson, is a Scotch colony of upwards of 100 persons, and it so happens that we have arranged to open a station. May we not, therefore, in circumstances like these, ask this Assembly, and through it the Free Church, to do something for the Scotch settlers? By the claims of the Scotch population in England being overlooked and neglected, many are lost to Presbyterianism; many are, in fact, lost to the Church of Christ altogether, who otherwise might be gathered into congregations. I would ask you, for the sake of the Free Church itself, to give us at least a helping hand in our endeavours to secure those young men, the flower of your population, who annually come up to settle in our midst. And I take leave to say that the best of them remain Presbyterians; and that in our little Church we have got a band of elders composed of young men—there being scarcely a gray-haired man among them—second to none in any Presbyterian Church in the world. (Applause.) These young men—the flower of your youth—come up, as I have said, and settle amongst us. When we get them into our Church, we, by the blessing of God, keep them Presbyterians; and they afterwards come back as Scotchmen to settle here in their native land, where they buy estates and prove efficient helpers to you in your work; but if they become Episcopalians, as many of them have done, you know what is the result. You know who are the parties who are building those little Episcopalian chapels all over your country. (Hear.) For the sake, then, of our common Presbyterianism, I ask you to help in this matter. (Loud cheers.)

Mr M'CAW was the next speaker—He stated that within the last thirty years, when the Synod was organised, the number of their congregations had been trebled. In illustration of this, Mr M'Caw said—Look at the Presbytery of London itself. In 1843, the year of the Disruption, there were only seven congregations in the Presbytery, whereas now there are thirty-two. (Cheers.) Thus, in these twenty-four years the number of congregations in one Presbytery had been more than quadrupled. During the same period they have built twenty churches, besides purchasing and enlarging various others, so that in all respects the Presbytery was now, in numbers, strengthened more than fourfold compared with what it was twenty-four years ago. And although other Presbyteries of the Church had not multiplied so rapidly as the Presbytery of London, yet in the Lancashire Presbytery and others, the increase had been more than fourfold compared with the numbers twenty-four years ago. Our organisation is complete, and what we want is simply an increased number of men and a larger amount of money, in order, by the blessing of God, to plant a Presbyterian Church in every large town. During the last four or five years we have planted churches in Swansea, Cardiff, Worcester, Shrewsbury, Norwich, and other places, besides multiplying the number in London and Liverpool, and Manchester. Last April no fewer than six charges were sanctioned and added to the roll of the Synod, and when you bear in mind that we have only 110 churches, I think you will admit that the addition of six in one year is a large proportion of increase. (Hear, hear.) Then nine years ago the amount of the funds contributed for home mission work was only about £600. Last year it was upwards of £1200, so that during that time our contributions to that one department have been more than doubled. There is no place that we can go to in England—none of the large towns—in which we do not find a disposition to receive us friendly and cordially, and the truth is that it only needs that one of the stations be nurtured and helped for a short time before it is ripe for calling a minister, and if it gets a man of the right stamp settled in it, there is no fear of abundant success. I mention these things to show that we do not come and seek your help without putting forth our own energies. But the work is too great for us. The openings are so multiplying on all sides that we cannot enter them. There are still eighteen counties in England, in not one of which is there a Presbyterian Church. There are more than forty towns, with populations ranging from 20,000 up to 100,000, where there is no Presbyterian Church. Now, in every one of these towns there are a considerable number of Scotchmen, and openings for a Presbyterian Church, and it is, in the first instance—I do not say that it is only on behalf of these—for our fellow-countrymen, that we appeal to you for help in carrying forward this work. It is computed that there are 4000 Scotchmen come across the border every year more than return from England. Now, it would require us, to overtake that influx alone, to build at the rate of four or five new churches every year. You follow your countrymen to Canada, to Australia, to the very ends of the earth, with Presbyterian ordinances; and I submit that you should not forget the country that lies immediately across your own border. (Applause.) We believe that when we are doing what we can to supply them with Presbyterian ordinances, we are doing your work—that we are doing work which,

if we do not do it, you would yourselves be obliged to do. (Hear, hear.) You would require to have your English Mission just as you have your Colonial Mission; and for that English Mission you would require to have your stated collection from year to year from your various congregations. We are perfectly willing to take at once the labour of the organisation and superintendence off your hand, and to do all we can in the way of furnishing men and means in endeavouring to overtake this work; but we cannot do it ourselves—it is far too heavy; and we therefore think that, in these circumstances, we have a claim, not only on the sympathy and prayers, but on the liberality of the Free Church of Scotland, so as to enable us to overtake it. (Applause.) The reverend gentleman then proceeded to show that they had also a duty to discharge towards the English population; and further, that in this work they had a claim on the Free Church, and pointed out the interest which the Free Church had, in common with other bodies, to do something for the lapsed masses, and in order to counteract the efforts which the Romanists were putting forth, convinced as the latter were that in another generation they would have converted England to the Roman Catholic faith; and that, if they succeeded in this, its influence on the rest of the world could not be over-estimated. On all these grounds he confidently appealed to the Free Church, and resumed his seat amid applause.

Mr WRIGHT said—When I first went from Scotland to Southampton, the Crimean war was at its height, and all the troops were shipped from that port. My settlement there brought me into very close contact with the army, and stirred up within me a deep interest in the Presbyterian soldiers. I turned to the Army List, and found that almost all the military stations were south of the Thames, and I may say within the limits of my jurisdiction. There were only two Presbyterian churches south of the Thames besides my own, and both of these were at the time vacant. I was therefore the only Presbyterian minister. There are, however, now about twenty congregations. I visited a number of the military stations, and found every encouragement given me, especially by the officers, and in course of time Presbyterian congregations were formed at Portsmouth, Chatham, Alderney, and Guernsey, and other places. I went over to the Presbyterian Church of Ireland, and found that they were exceedingly willing to help me, and they formed a congregation at Plymouth. That work was going on most favourably. I took a leaf out of the Church of Rome, whose practice it was to plant a priest wherever there was a military station, to secure a grant from Government, and by and by a civilian congregation was formed at the place, and a chapel erected. I thought that what wrought so well with them might be advantageously applied to Presbyterianism. The plan wrought admirably, and would have gone on till this day, but the Established Church of Scotland, who had never done anything for the troops up till that time, leaving the military stations bare and barren, so far as supplying religious services for Presbyterian troops were concerned, stepped in and claimed the whole of the chaplaincies, and in almost every case a desperate struggle had to be made to maintain our position, and from some of these stations we were driven. I do not know a single station in which we had planted churches where this course had not been followed. If that Church had acted in a some-

what different spirit, looking after these where there was no Presbyterian Church, I should gladly have given them all the help in my power, and have rejoiced in their efforts. I would, therefore, suggest to this Free Church that she might appoint a deputation to proceed with our committee to the War Office, and to claim that we should be recognised precisely as the Scotch Established Church is; so that, were we to take up a position in a garrison town where there was no other Presbyterian church, we should not be supplanted by any one coming afterwards from the Establishment. (Applause.) I was for two years myself a chaplain to the Royal Hospital at Netley, and found that nine-tenths of all the men registered as Presbyterians belonged to other sections of the Presbyterian Church than the Establishment. They belonged to the Irish Presbyterian Church, to the United Presbyterian, and almost the whole Highland brigade to the Free Church; while the Welsh Fusiliers belonged to the Welsh Calvinistic body; and those who were Baptists and Independents were also registered as Presbyterians. I therefore think that a good case might be made out if we were to proceed to the War Office and claim to be recognised in the manner I have stated. We wish for no advantages, but for a fair field and no favour. (Applause.) There is another matter to which I would wish to call the attention of this Assembly. There are a large number of Scotchmen and Scotchwomen who proceed south at the beginning of winter, and live there throughout that season of the year, in order to have the benefit of our more genial climate. From Hastings, I may say from Dover on to Falmouth, you will find every five miles Scotch invalids. Many of those have to go either to other than Presbyterian churches, or to stay away from religious ordinances. The Ritualists have shown great wisdom in the manner in which they set up district churches for the floating population; and in this way they carry their poison into many families. I know that there is a little difference of opinion whether it is right to countenance Presbyterian propagandism. We, however, do not raise that question, but we simply come to this house to tell you that there are Presbyterians who go to stay for a short time at Torquay, Weymouth, Bridport, and other watering-places, and that if support were given for the formation of stations, the nucleus of a good congregation would be formed, while we would do what would be acceptable to many of these invalids, who would also give us assistance. Why might not Presbyterian congregations be formed in this way at Ventnor, Isle of Wight, Exmouth, Bridport, and other places, where there is a considerable Scotch population; and why should not invalid ministers of your own Church, before they are broken down in health with hard work, be invited to come and minister at these places for a short time? Were this done, by rest and change of climate many a valuable life would be spared for the service of the Church. (Applause.) Another point to which I would invite your attention is in reference to the southern counties of England. In all the towns south, from the Thames and the Severn, there are a very large number of boarding-schools; and these are supported by Scotch families, families from Ireland, and by parties from America. It is very remarkable that a large number of these schools are under the influence of the Tractarian and Ritualistic party. When at Brighton I went, on a week-day evening, into a celebrated Puseyite or Ritualistic church,

and found that the great bulk consisted of five or six boarding-schools. These schools are of the highest order and rank, and I know that in them are children from Scotland sent there to finish their education. Now, let me suppose that a Presbyterian family sends down its daughters to a school of this description. Will they not go back sneering at your Protestantism and Presbyterianism, and telling you that yours is not a respectable enough Church, and that it is not a Church to which anybody of respectability ought to show countenance? And will not principles be thus implanted in their minds subversive of all that religious training which they may have received in their earlier years? (Applause.) If we had Presbyterian congregations established in these towns, to which Presbyterian families of stability could send their children for their education, instruction could be sent to the Presbyterian ministers to make inquiry after them, and to see that their religious interests were properly attended to. In fact, I have determined myself, if I can only get anything like support, to establish two schools of high order in Southampton, one for boys and the other for girls, entirely under Presbyterian influence, while, at the same time, conducted by English ladies and gentlemen; and in this way, while giving the best possible education, care will be taken for providing for the spiritual interests of the pupils. (Applause.) If any member of this Assembly wishes to send any of his children, or if he knows of anybody doing so, I shall be happy to do all I can to see that their interests are in this way cared for.

Mr THOMAS MATHESON next addressed the Assembly. After stating that Mr Lockhart, the treasurer of their Home Mission Scheme, had been obliged to leave Edinburgh to attend to business of importance, he said—We, the English Presbyterian Church, seek to maintain a testimony for the truth in the south. The more we extend our system in England, the more will we commend the system of Presbyterianism in that land, and provide religious ordinances for those who may settle amongst us from Scotland. Many of these parties display a tendency when they proceed south to go to fashionable churches, instead of joining the more humble places of worship which we maintain. It is therefore of importance that we should do something by which our friends might be induced not to fall away from those religious ordinances in which they have been brought up. The Home Mission of our Church has been much occupied in assisting struggling congregations on the Borders in the north, where there is a considerable population, but where the people are not in circumstances to maintain worship amongst themselves without aid from without. Our Church has no Sustentation Fund such as your Church has; but by means of the Home Mission Fund, assistance is given in the way I have mentioned. So that at present not one of those congregations in the north has an income under L.100; and a great effort is at present being made to secure that none of our ministers shall have less than L.150. (Applause.) We have at present one hundred and sixteen churches and sanctioned charges, and I am glad to say that taking the poor and the prosperous ones together, our average income to each minister last year was L.213. (Renewed applause.) As already explained, our own Home Mission Fund is ample for our own home purposes; and if it were not for the desire to extend the Presbyterian system in England, we should not be here to-day to plead either for men or money.

But in 1862 our friends of the Presbyterian Church of Ireland, looking at the matter in an enlightened way, sent us word that they were prepared to send us the sum of L.700 if we would spend it on Church extension in England, and if for every pound that they sent we should raise another. (Applause.) This really was the beginning of our Church Extension Scheme. In 1863 we formed a Church Building and Debt Extinction Fund. An amount was raised of L.25,000, which was multiplied into something like L.150,000 by the mode of operation. The income of our Home Mission Fund in 1858 was only L.650, but last year it was L.1300. The expenditure in 1858 was only L.800, but last year it was L.2000. Of that L.2000 only L.700 was spent on the ordinary work of the Church, and L.1300 was spent for Church extension. The appeal made last year to you in Scotland yielded a net sum of nearly L.2000. That sum is to be spent entirely on Church extension purposes. You will understand that in providing new stations in England we give L.500 to the congregations, but we have no wish that any Church-extension charge should be set up unless there is a distinct expectation, not only of its being self-supporting, but of its becoming a Church-extension Church itself. (Cheers.) We have, as I have already indicated, taken up the question of the support of the ministry, and there is a very great desire to raise the standard of ministerial income. During last winter a committee of elders was formed to take charge of this matter, and we have been going on in the work. Our object is that the standard should be raised all through the Church, but especially that our town congregations should not be left in a miserable starving condition. (Applause.) I am glad to say that already a considerable increase has taken place. We wish through the ordinary sources to secure that ministers should be maintained, and in addition that incomes should be supplemented where necessary, so that an adequate sum of from L.400 even to L.500 and L.600 a-year should be the income of our ministers. (Applause.) I am glad to say that already we have one congregation giving L.700 to their minister, two giving L.600 each, and about six giving from L.500 to L.550 a-year each; and cases of this kind will, we hope, increase. (Renewed applause.) In conclusion, I would observe that I regard the Free Church somewhat in the light of a nursery-garden. You have valuable plants, some of which, however, are too thickly planted together. Might I suggest that if we could only get some of these plants moved to our southern climate it would be the means of doing good to themselves and benefiting us, for were that done all would be benefited, and they would spread their fragrance all around. (Applause.)

Dr JULIUS WOOD, after referring to the great demand which there was for church building throughout the country, and the interest which the Free Church had in a work of that kind, expressed a desire for some further information as to the working of the Debt Extinction and Church Extension Fund of the English Presbyterian Church.

Mr DUNCAN said he was always delighted to tell what they were doing in England, and after stating that as this was the first time he appeared in the Assembly, he was very unwilling to come before them as representing poor relations—(laughter and applause)—he then proceeded: About three years ago it was suggested in our Synod that a Debt Extinction and Church building fund should be established, and it was thought at the time that it was a very bold proposition which was made,

that Dr Hamilton—(applause)—and other influential ministers and elders should go forth and endeavour to raise L.25,000. We thought that it was a great work; and I know that Dr Hamilton felt that a very great and heavy responsibility had been laid upon him. I am very thankful to report, as you have already heard to-day, that it turned out to be a most successful enterprise. (Applause.) He got the sum of L.25,000 after a very little trouble. He obtained it from some 380 individuals. (Cheers.) I have the great honour and the very pleasing duty of being the treasurer of that fund. I can assure you that I have found it to be a very pleasing duty; and from many individuals I have received the most grateful thanks, as if I had some particular hand in the work. Of that L.25,000 which was promised to be paid up in five years, we have now actually received L.15,949, and we have used the money in this way. We had, I believe, to extinguish all the debt, at least, we had to extinguish all upon every church connected with us who were willing to apply for aid; and if there was debt still remaining, it was on congregations who were so strong that they would not apply to us for help. We have, at an outlay of L.4846, paid to thirty-two congregations, relieved them of debt through their own exertions to the extent of L.23,470. (Applause.) We compute that on that there was about L.1150 of interest that would be set free for Christian work. Then, by the use of a corresponding L.4500 given as grants to those who were prepared to build new churches, we have had additional places of worship of the value of L.38,000; so that by the use of L.9346 we have got property of the value of L.61,470 now in the hands of the Church. (Cheers.) And by going on at the same ratio, and allowing that our loans shall be repaid, it is estimated that by the time we shall have spent our L.25,000, we shall have acquired for the Church property of the value of L.170,000—(cheers)—so that the Assembly will see how very successful the scheme has been. Before sitting down, I shall only further say that I hope the Assembly will take greater interest in our work in England. When I left my parental roof and went to Dundee to enter upon business, I was (said Mr Duncan, addressing the Moderator) a member of the congregation over which you so ably presided. Thirty-three or thirty-five years have elapsed since then, and brought with it great changes. I happened to be at sea at the time when the Disruption took place, and when I came home I had to make my election whether I could join the Free or the Established Church. Well do I recollect that when I had to do so I was advised by some friends to keep a wide berth, to use a seaman's phrase. I had, however, no hesitation in throwing myself into the Free Church movement; and to-day I find myself addressing this Assembly for the first time. (Loud cheers.)

A short conversation then took place on the subject, in the course of which Mr Paterson, in answer to Dr Candlish, who was anxious for some specific suggestions from the deputation, said that what the English Presbyterian Church would like would be something like a contribution of L.1500 from the Free Church for four or five years, as that would be required to enable them to carry on their operations. Probably the Free Church might do what the Irish Presbyterian Church did. For example, that Church took charge of a station at Plymouth, and paid all the supplies, and when it was organised into a congregation, and had acquired a state of consolidation, their Irish Presbyterian

friends handed it over to the English Presbyterian Church, and it was now one of their congregations.

Mr MATHESON, of Hampstead, also stated that it was desirable that the Assembly or its committee should name the ministers who were to proceed to England to assist in the formation and organisation of stations.

Mr CAMERON, of Ardersier, here rose for the purpose of urging the claims of the Highlands ; and while doing so

Mr DAVID MACLAGAN, (elder,) spoke to order. Their friends of the English Presbyterian Church deputation had with great courtesy given up the time to which they were entitled yesterday in order that the union debate might be terminated. (Loud cries of "Hear, hear," and applause.) The time at their disposal that morning was exceedingly limited ; and he therefore trusted that the Assembly would not allow any other question to be interposed. (Hear, hear.)

Mr PATERSON said that they did not put their claims in competition with that of any other work or any other place. They presented their claims on their own merits.

Mr Cameron still continuing to address the House, Dr Candlish took exception to this, and said that they might as well have the claims introduced. (Hear, hear.) The feeling of the Assembly being against Mr Cameron, he resumed his seat.

Mr MACLAGAN then rose and said—On the particular subject now under the consideration of the House, I feel a very peculiar interest, from reasons that must be known to most of the members. I had to remove to the south five years since with my family ; and this placed me in circumstances which enabled me to form some idea of the obligations under which those who have to proceed to England, or who have friends and relatives there, have been laid by the English Presbyterian Church, in providing a supply of Presbyterian ordinances. (Applause.) Now, I suppose that there are very few families indeed connected with the Free Church, and very few probably in the House, who have not relatives in England. The only provision in which they could have entire confidence for the promotion of their spiritual interests was in connexion with the Presbyterian Church in England ; and I do most earnestly hope that this House will rise to something like a due sense of the amount of obligation which lies on the Free Church in connexion with this matter. (Applause.) As to the practical suggestion which has been made by the Moderator of the Synod of raising L.1500 a year, I do not think that there is anything unreasonable in it. A biennial collection does not amount probably to L.3000 in the case of the Irish Presbyterian Church ; and it is from no feeling whatever of anything like competition when I say that I think we ought to place the two Churches on the same footing. (Applause.) By all means continue the assistance to the Irish Presbyterian Church ; but if the two were placed alongside of each other I have no fear what the result of the comparison would be. Every year we are sending from Scotland to England at the rate of four thousand members of our families ; and I do not think that we send even four hundred to Ireland ; and on the whole I am sure that, when all things are considered, the claims of the English Presbyterian Church to something like permanent help from us in working their Church extension scheme is unanswerable. (Cheers.) I

rejoice to find, from intercourse amongst the members of this House, that there is a growing feeling and desire that we should put forth the energies of our Church in the direction of helping forward and strengthening the Presbyterian cause in England; and I would, before sitting down, just like to say a word as to the character of the Church that we are asked to aid in this direction. This English Presbyterian Church, not only in its missionary efforts abroad, but in its home efforts, is doing a work altogether out of proportion with that which we are doing as a Free Church. (Hear, hear.) If we put the figures alongside of each other, and the numerical strength of our respective bodies, we shall find that the Presbyterian Church of England is not a Church coming to us seeking to be relieved from the responsibility of diffusing the gospel in England; but that it asks us to do something in enabling her to look after the spiritual interests of our own sons and daughters, and in putting forth our efforts, it is surely worth well to consider that we are helping one that is a really working Church, and that besides what she is doing at home, she has one of the most successful missions on the face of the earth. (Cheers.) There is in fact no mission that is at all equal in point of success, at this moment, to that which is carried on in China by our English Presbyterian friends. In helping her, therefore, we are helping a really working Church—one which, besides this great effort on behalf of the heathen abroad, is endeavouring to spread the knowledge of the Lord in London, Liverpool, and Manchester, and those other great centres of population in the South. (Loud applause.)

Mr JAMES BALFOUR, W.S., concurred with Mr Maclagan, and strongly supported his views. He stated that he did not know any Church which had such strong claims upon the Free Church, and he hoped that the proposal for the biennial collections alternately with the Irish Church would be agreed to—thus putting the two Churches upon the same footing. He also mentioned that he had been one of a deputation from the Free Church to the last meeting of the English Presbyterian Synod at Manchester, and that he was quite delighted with the spirit which was manifested there, and with the energy which seemed to be infused into their proceedings.

Mr MILLER, of Leithen, also concurred with the remarks that had fallen from the two preceding speakers, adding that he also had been upon the deputation to the synod, and while he was there he had an opportunity of seeing the extent of the great work in which that Church was engaged, and of the services which it was rendering to Presbyterianism.

Mr DAVID DICKSON stated that he had received a letter from a friend in England, to the effect that if the Free Church and the English Presbyterian Church were to form stations in the leading towns, with ministers placed over them, many parties would leave the English Church and join them, as they were so dissatisfied with the present state of their own Church.

After some further remarks, it was agreed that when the committee on Assembly arrangements presented their report a deliverance should be brought up to the effect that the names of those ministers who were to be sent to England should be submitted for the sanction of the Assembly, and that the English brethren should be invited to send a deputation every second year to occupy the pulpits of the Free Church

in the different parts of the country—presenting the claims of their Church before the congregations, and giving them the opportunity of making collections.

Dr CANDLISH thought that the proposal about army chaplains should be withdrawn ; and to this suggestion Mr Wright agreed.

Mr SWANSON, missionary from China, then addressed the House on the subject of the Chinese mission of the English Presbyterian Church. He stated that the mission was founded twenty years ago, and that their first missionary was the Rev. William Burns, whose name only required to be mentioned in that House to be received with the utmost respect. (Applause.) Mr Burns had infused his own spirit into every part of the work ; all who had followed him, and been associated with him, had imbibed the same spirit, and to this he ascribed the remarkable success which had been vouchsafed. The head quarters of the mission were in the island of Amoy. When he (Mr Swanson) went there, eight years ago, there were three missionary societies engaged—the English Presbyterian, and the missions of the London Missionary Society, and of the Dutch Reformed Church of the United States of America. There were 400 persons then in full communion, but now the number was more than 1000 ; and of these, 800 were under the supervision of the English Presbyterian and Reformed Dutch Churches. The missionaries of all these different bodies worked together with a remarkable spirit of Christian unity. All around the region of Amoy, and on the opposite mainland, they had planted stations, until now there were thirteen mission churches on that mainland, extending over a line of 120 miles. Mr Swanson then referred to the self-sacrificing spirit the Chinese converts displayed, and said that, instead of their gaining any temporal advantage by becoming Christians, as was sometimes insinuated, they attested the sincerity of their convictions in every case by suffering persecution, for no native Chinese could become a Christian without suffering persecution at the first, and without sacrificing all his patrimonial rights. They had twenty-seven native evangelists in connexion with the mission, and it was in a great measure owing to the services of these evangelists that they had achieved their success. He believed that almost every member of their Church was a missionary, and when they left they carried the gospel away to other parts of China. In fact, the European missionaries had to follow in the footsteps of these men in planting their new stations. The converts were men of whom any Church might be proud. They had now formed a native Presbytery, and all the documents were written and the proceedings carried on in the Chinese language. After referring to the great extent of the country, and describing the Chinese as the Saxons of the East, he said that they were a highly civilised people, and had solved the problem of what civilisation could do for a nation without the gospel. Some people said, first introduce commerce and civilisation, and then the gospel ; but those who spoke in this way had only to come out to China to find out their mistake. Their work there was a most interesting one : and he spent a most happy time amongst these people. There was a wrong*idea in the minds of many as to the character and position of a missionary. Missionaries were supposed by some to be a sort of banished men, requiring a very special degree of sympathy, and when they came home, they were even exhibited as live specimens of what missionaries were. (Laughter.) This was an

entire mistake ; if any one would come out and see their work, and the pleasure with which they engaged in it, they would find that their sympathies were required, not for the missionaries, but for the work itself. Referring to the character of the Chinese, he remarked that there was a great deal of most absurd statements sent forth upon the subject by literary men. He knew something of the manner in which this was gone about. Some of these writing men came out to China, and settled in a coast town for five or six weeks, and then on coming home, wrote a full and flowing description of all the social and political history of 420 millions of people ; and he did not know which most to admire, the ability or the ingenuity of the writers. (Laughter and applause.) After stating that they had a mission in the island of Formosa, and another at Swatow, and commending the mission to the Free Church as one worthy of support, Mr Swanson concluded amid loud applause.

Dr CANDLISH proposed that the Moderator convey the thanks of the Assembly to the deputies for their interesting statements. (Applause.)

The MODERATOR, addressing the deputation, said—To perform the duty now laid upon me is with me no matter of form, but one of heartfelt interest. I am a constant reader of the *Weekly Review*, and I am therefore in a position to know of your proceedings. I think it impossible for any man regularly to peruse that publication without being deeply impressed with a sense of your religious earnestness, your evangelistic activity, and Christian liberality. And I do feel that all these entitle you to the warmest sympathy of this Church, and to all the support and encouragement which the cordial expression of that sympathy can afford ; yea, I think it puts you in the position of a Church provoking others to similar works of faith and labours of love. I have been particularly interested, first of all, in the efforts of your Church, more especially of your enlightened and liberal office-bearers, to make a more liberal provision for the support of your ministers. This object has been referred to to-day. In prosecuting that movement you are acting in harmony with our own Church and with all the disestablished Churches of the land—I may say with the Established also. At the same time, you are prosecuting an object the success of which has a bearing on the highest interests of religion, for it has long since passed into the currency of a proverb, that “an insufficient maintenance makes a scandalous ministry.” Then, in respect to the particular object which has brought us together in conference this day—I refer to your home mission and Church extension work—I say that in helping you we are helping ourselves, for we are using the most effectual means of retaining in the faith of their fathers our children who, in the providence of God, may be settled in England. As a parent I have a particular interest in this view, and I trust you will never relax your efforts in this direction until every important centre of population in England is supplied with a Presbyterian ministry. I cannot allow this opportunity to pass without expressing my most cordial concurrence in the sentiments which fell from a gentleman on the left hand of the chair—Mr Maclagan. It is a circumstance most creditable to your spirit of missionary enterprise—that at this moment, with a Church consisting of not more than seven Presbyteries and not many more than 100 congregations, you are able even with the assistance you derive from Scotland—to support on the mission field in China no fewer than nine missionaries ; and let me say that

among them are some of the most distinguished and devoted labourers that ever entered the mission field. (Hear, hear, and applause.) And, although the subject has not been adverted to this day, I think this a proper opportunity for me to express the sympathy of myself and of this Church with your Church under the mysterious and solemn providence whereby you were in November last deprived of the services of the Rev. David Masson, just when about to enter on the field to which you had devoted him only a few months before. I hope the appeal which has been issued from your Foreign Mission committee will be answered by some probationer or young minister of your own or of this Church, and that a man animated with the same spirit, and possessed of the same gifts, may be found to occupy the field still left vacant by the death of Mr Masson. On all these accounts, you are entitled to our warmest sympathy and cordial help. But there is one further argument, and I do not think I would be doing my duty if I did not advert to it. I cannot conceive it possible that the Protestant and Christian principle, or even the common sense and patriotism of the English people, will continue to tolerate the existing state of things in their national Church—a Church torn by questions respecting ritual ceremonies and observances, and by rationalistic and sceptical speculations, which, it appears, there is no Church authority to settle and determine. What will be the issue of this state of things it is impossible for us to foresee—a second Reformation possibly—an entire dissolution of the connexion between Church and State; or possibly the Church of England shall become out and out rationalistic, and the friends of pure religion shall have to seek in a disruption the only safe future for evangelical truth in England. In any event, it is of unspeakable importance that the people of England should have presented to them an ecclesiastical system which exhibits the advantages of comely order—the scriptural rights and privileges of the Christian people regulated and protected by Church authority, exercised without secular interference—a sound scriptural theology—and those simple and primitive forms of worship which, if not identical with spirituality, are greatly conducive to it. On all these grounds, I doubt not, we will most cordially aid you in carrying on the great and important work in which you are engaged; and thus we shall occupy the position of a Church holding out a helping hand to the Presbyterian Church of Ireland on the one hand, and to the Presbyterian Church of England or the other. (Applause.)

THE UNION DIVISION.

On the minutes being read,

MR R. C. SMITH said he thought an alteration was made in the first clause of Dr Candlish's motion. As read by the Clerk, it was in the form in which notice had been given.

SIR H. W. MONCREIFF—There was no alteration made. Dr Candlish made an explanation as to the meaning of the clause, and indicated his readiness to alter the motion if people wished it; but it was not asked.

DR CANDLISH—That is precisely the state of the case. I asked to be allowed to make an alteration if wished; but gentlemen did not want to make the alteration. I stated what was the meaning of my motion, and would have been quite willing to have had it altered to express that meaning more clearly if wished.

Dr MURRAY MITCHELL—That was precisely the reason why I allowed the motion to stand as it is. Dr Candlish's explanation was so clear that there seemed no reason to change it.

Mr M'GREGOR—I have to apologise to Mr Smith for interrupting him last night in his remarks on this point. I thought he was debating a question not before the House. I had precisely the same feeling as has been expressed; and just because I saw that the motion was perfectly to the point, I voted for Dr Candlish.

Mr BALFOUR—Having supported Dr Begg's motion, as the most likely in my view to promote union, I wish to know whether it is competent for me to sign both the reasons of dissent by Mr Nixon and those by Dr Gibson, because Dr Gibson's reasons bear rather upon the constitutional question, and Mr Nixon's upon the matter of union.

Sir H. W. MONCREIFF—I wish the minutes affirmed before we consider any question of that kind.

The minutes were affirmed.

The names of Mr Nisbet and Mr John Bean, elder, were given in as adhering to Dr Begg's protest.

Mr NISBET—I also adhere to Mr Nixon's reasons of dissent.

A few other adherences were intimated.

Mr THORBURN—I suppose there can be no objection to Mr Balfour subscribing both reasons of dissent put in. There was no objection to parties voting for both. (Hear, hear.)

Mr BALFOUR—Very well.

Sir H. W. MONCREIFF—I find that in the protest given in, we have recorded, so far as I can see, one name at least of a member who did not vote. I do not know how far it is regular or legal to put either to a dissent or protest the name of a person who took no part in the vote. It seems to me that we must exclude the name of any person who took no part in the vote. (Hear.)

Mr STARK—You are entitled to do so; but I humbly submit whether it would be expedient or wise to do it.

Sir H. W. MONCREIFF—It is contrary to all precedent, and it would be very dangerous as a rule to allow the signature of any person who was not present at the vote.

Mr STARK—I think it would be better you should allow it.

Sir H. W. MONCREIFF—A person might not be present at the end; and might not know how the thing stood when the vote was taken.

Mr NISBET—I think it would be very awkward or even wrong. The discussion might have changed at the end.

Dr CANDLISH—Clerks of Presbyteries and of all other Church Courts are very tenacious on the point of order; but it has been the practice of this Assembly, before and since the Disruption, to be very considerate in allowing persons to exonerate their consciences. I think it has been the practice to give all facilities to members of this Court to exonerate their consciences by way of dissent and protest.

Mr DUNLOP—it would certainly be an awkward thing to allow a person to dissent who did not vote; but I think a person in such circumstances might be allowed to protest.

Sir H. MONCREIFF—I am quite willing to recognise Mr Dunlop's distinction. The only question that could arise there would be whether you would allow a protest at all.

Dr CANDLISH—I do not, for my part, comprehend what the protest means. I know that, during the Auchterarder controversy in the ten years' conflict, our friend, Dr Cook, was in the practice of emphatically protesting. What that meant beyond a dissent I never could comprehend, unless he meant to leave the Church. (Hear, hear.) On the whole, I think it is a thing more honoured in the breach than the observance. But perhaps we have disposed of that matter by allowing it to lie on the table.

Dr BUCHANAN—I must protest against this discussion—(a laugh)—upon a question not before the House. It was merely a question whether the name of a particular individual should be allowed to remain at all. (Get on, Get on.)

Mr NISBET—Dr Candlish has made a remark about a protest. I have to make another—a protest is sometimes very important.

Mr COWAN—In the House of Commons the rule is that, in matters of this kind, those who do not vote are not allowed to remain in the House.

Sir H. W. MONCREIFF—The House of Commons rules cannot be applied here. I protest against that. (Laughter.)

The subject then dropped.

PRESBYTERIAN UNION IN AMERICA—TRANSATLANTIC TELEGRAM.

Dr BUCHANAN—I have a communication of a very pleasing kind to make to the Assembly; and perhaps the House will allow me to make it just now. It has been sent me by Dr Field, one of the American deputies whom we had the pleasure of seeing here the other day. It so happened that our own deputies to the American Assemblies were present in those Assemblies about the same time as our friends were here; and I am sure that it will be of interest to hear what they have done—the two General Assemblies in America. The telegram was transmitted from New York, yesterday evening, to Dr Field. (Hear, hear.) It is to the following effect:—

“The Presbyterian churches have agreed upon a basis of union, which has been referred to the respective parties for confirmation; and it is considered almost certain to be approved of.” (Warm applause.)

Mr COWAN—I beg to propose that a copy of that communication be sent to our friends, Dr Gibson and Dr Begg. (A laugh.)

Mr NISBET—Moderator, that is very insulting.

Dr CANDLISH—The honourable gentleman is clearly out of order.

CHURCH AND MANSE BUILDING.

Mr WILSON gave in the report of this committee, (No. IX.) There were several overtures in favour of a more frequent collection for this fund. Mr Wilson, in giving in the report, called attention briefly to the various features of it. He also brought the special report of the same committee on the Condition of Ecclesiastical Buildings. In conclusion, he had to ask the Assembly to consider whether they could give them a collection this year, as they deprived them of half of the collection last year.

The Assembly approved of the reports, and referred the question of a collection for the fund until the report of the committee on Collections.

Mr M'GREGOR, Paisley, proposed the following motion, of which he

had given notice :—“That the Assembly appoint a committee to inquire into the whole matter of insurance, as brought up by the overtures ; to confer with Presbyteries thereanent ; and, having digested any suggestions received by them, to report to next Assembly.” He was glad to mention that a number of the very ablest men in Scotland were willing to be members of the committee.

Dr CANDLISH seconded the motion.

Mr ROBERT MACKENZIE, Dundee, remarked that the amounts dealt with by Mr M'Gregor's proposal were much larger than they at first sight appeared. Experience proved that the fund which would be formed out of fire insurance premiums would accumulate very rapidly. The sum annually paid at present by those congregations which insured their property was £875. Had this sum been accumulating since the Disruption, it would have amounted to £36,000 or £38,000. And the only deductions from it, besides the expenses of management, which could not be large, would have been the cost of the two churches which had been destroyed by fire since the Disruption, and a trifling amount of loss by partial fires ; and as yet only one half the property of the Free Church was insured. If they could prevail upon all, or nearly all, their congregations to insure, by the end of the century a building fund worth looking at would be accumulated.

The motion was agreed to ; and an overture from the Presbytery of Lockerby, asking the Assembly to recommend congregations to form a fund for keeping the buildings in proper repair, was remitted to the same committee.

SABBATH OBSERVANCE.

Mr ALEX. MACKENZIE, in submitting this report, (No. XX.,) briefly alluded to the various points upon which it touched. On the question of Sabbath desecration, it had been said that shareholders who felt aggrieved could at once get relief by selling out ; but, he asked, was it right that we should have any work, public or private, in which a conscientious Christian man could not engage, or that we should have any concern in which he could not invest his means, without subjecting him, directly or indirectly, to a trampling upon the divine law ? With regard to the bills of Mr Hughes and Lord Amberley, he hoped the Assembly would petition against such measures, and he expressed his great delight at the noble stand taken by the United Presbyterian Synod regarding them. (Hear, hear.) It was not that they had ever doubted their United Presbyterian brethren did not value the Sabbath as much as they themselves did, but at the present juncture, when so much was said about their differences, he felt assured they were substantially agreed as to the magistrate's duty on this great matter of the Sabbath, for this very reason, that they were at one in their action. (Applause.) He next pointed out the duty of ministers to warn those under their charge who might visit the Paris Exhibition against conforming to the customs in France respecting the Lord's-day, and concluded by remarking that our Sabbaths were being stolen from us, and we were saying very little about it. Mammon, pleasure, and loose views on the subject were stealing it away from us, and he believed that in our day one cause was the great worldliness existing in the Church.

Mr MILLER of Leithen deplored the handing over of our railways to

English companies—it will have (if carried out) the effect of bringing our railways into the practice very much adopted in England of carrying on a traffic on the Lord's day not greatly different from it as on other days. He moved the adoption of the report, and that the House petition against the two bills above referred to.

Dr WYLIE seconded the motion, and said that in the case of the Sabbath we had no alternative between worship and labour, and that if we abandoned the proper observance of the Sabbath, it would be attended with a decreasing population, a dying commerce, a stricken and dying virtue, and a decadence of national character.

Dr LONGMUIR, Aberdeen, thought they should deal with the owners of steamboats whose orders compelled men to work on Sabbath.

Mr KIDSTON, Glasgow, (elder,) said that as a Wharncliffe meeting of the Glasgow and South-Western Railway was shortly to be held in Glasgow, he had 510 proxies, representing £400,000 of stock, against the amalgamation, and he advised all who held stock, and were desirous to preserve the Sabbath, to forward their proxies to him.

The motion was agreed to.

REPORT ON TEMPERANCE.

Mr WILLIAM KIDSTON, (elder,) submitted the report of the committee on Temperance, (No. XXI.) Mr Kidston said—It would be easy for him to use a familiar quotation, to cause the House to “sup on horrors,” by conducting them in imagination through the police courts, jails, penitentiaries, and mad-houses of the country, or to make a half-hour's stay in a public-house situated in a crowded locality on a Saturday night, or thereafter to enter the dwellings of the people to see the domestic broils and bitterness which drunkenness produces. He had himself been brought into contact with the sad evils connected with this vice in prosecuting his labours as a territorial Sabbath-school teacher, and when afterwards placed on the Commission of the Peace for the counties of Lanark and Dumbarton, he had considered it his duty to attend faithfully all meetings of the Licensing Courts. In this way he might be permitted to say that he had gained such experience as enabled him to be of some assistance in passing the Public-Houses Act of 1862—an Act, he was happy to say, through which it had hitherto been found impossible to drive a wheelbarrow, much less the traditional coach and six. (Applause.) Reference was made in the report to the causes of intemperance, one of which was the excessive number of public-houses. These were far beyond the real wants of the community, or what could be justified on any honest plea of legitimate refreshment. A cognate subject to this was the want of a proper enforcement of the laws for the regulation and control of public-houses. For this excess and want of proper control more parties were to blame than one. The police are expressly enjoined by statute to enforce the provisions of the Act, but they did not always do so. Fiscals were instructed to prosecute all offenders, and were protected and remunerated in the discharge of their duty, but it was not always attended to. Magistrates had in some cases acted upon their own idea of what the law ought to be, instead of administering the statute as they found it; they had consequently given too much weight to the private pecuniary interests of those who profit by drunkenness; not having the moral well-being of the community properly before them,

when enjoined by the statute not to license a greater number than was "meet and convenient." But there was no doubt that the public have been to blame—they have been very apathetic and neglectful of their duty. When the reduction of the number of public-houses was spoken of, it had sometimes been objected that this was an interference with the "liberty of the subject;" but he wished to bring the fact under the notice of the House, that, by the present law, it was as much the liberty of one subject to object to a public-house as it was the liberty of another to make application for one. On that account he recommended that the public should pay more attention to the privileges conferred upon them by the eleventh section of the Act. By the Act of 1862, which declared that there should be no such thing as a vested interest in a public-house, "a house not licensed at the time of making application" is declared to be a new house. He would like to make a remark or two on the case of grocers' licence; no place should have a grocer's licence where the parties live on the premises, so that there might be no temptation to evade the law. The magistrates of Glasgow were now withdrawing certificates from all grocers who were convicted of selling or giving to be drunk on the premises. It was thought in some places that grocers could open their shops before eight, or after eleven, provided they did not sell exciseable liquors; but this was not the case—they were prohibited from "exposing for" sale any liquors, and the moment their doors were open the goods were exposed for sale. He believed this would require to be looked after in Edinburgh. It was, however, gratifying to notice that at the recent Whitsunday licensing courts, deputations from various parts of the country had waited upon the magistrates, to urge upon them the necessity of reducing the number of public-houses and enforcing the terms of certificate. He thought it necessary to take some notice of a deputation which waited on the Lord Provost and magistrates of Edinburgh, and the remarks made by Lord Provost Chambers in reply to their memorials. His lordship was reported to have stated that the magistrates, in limiting the number of public-houses, would run the risk of increasing the number of shebeens. He was surprised that any one acquainted with the subject could suppose that shebeens were a substitute for public-houses. If his lordship had stated that unless public-houses were allowed to be open all night, and on Sabbath, they would run the risk of increasing the number of shebeens, his statement would in that case have been at all events intelligible. The Lord Provost, moreover, stated that the magistrate had no control over shebeens; but the Act of 1862 had, in conformity with the report of the Royal Commission, not only enjoined that public-houses should not be open after eleven o'clock, or on Sabbath, but had given such ample powers to suppress shebeens that no willing magistrate could have the slightest difficulty in at once putting them down. Facts and statistics have now proved beyond all doubt that drunkenness increased in proportion to the number of public-houses. The case of Liverpool showed this, and, if time permitted, he could give them many cases from his own experience. In this matter it was the supply that created the demand. It was noticed in the report that there was one abuse of the statute which greatly discouraged efforts to reduce the number of public-houses, and that was the practice of bringing up before the Licensing Courts applications for the same new houses every half-year. Public opinion should impress upon the magis-

trates that the decision given at Whitsunday should last for a year ; and indeed that it should be considered *res judicata*, and not entertained again till there was reasonable grounds of supposing such a change of circumstances as might entitle the parties to a rehearing. Another cause of intemperance arose from the circumstance that many became the victims of the drinking customs of the country. It was painful to notice that, among a certain class in making a bargain, the offer was made in drink, accepted in drink, and clenched in drink. (Hear, hear.) But another part of the report put the question, What can be done by the Church ? This was an important question for the consideration of the House. It was recommended that a sermon on intemperance should be preached in the course of the year from all the pulpits of the Free Church. This suggestion he hoped the House would agree to, and allow it to be included in the deliverance of the Assembly. (Hear, hear.) He would not like to omit to notice with gratitude the labours of temperance societies ; without these we would probably have been worse than we are, and the arguments they now employ for the entire disuse of intoxicating drinks were based upon Christian expediency. They had certainly at least the merit of continuing to expose the evils, and interesting the public to attempt a cure. There was another topic in which they could not help taking an interest, namely, the efforts of the people of England to get their beer-houses and their public-houses shut on the whole of the Sabbath. The desire for this in England seemed to be increasing. It was worthy of notice, also, that the people of England were agitating for an alteration in their licensing law ; this would require to be closely watched, so that the alteration might be a beneficial one. He concluded by urging upon them to use all moral, social, and legislative remedies for staying the evils of intemperance. (Applause.)

Professor DOUGLAS moved the deliverance :—“ The Assembly urge upon the ministers and members of the Church the duty of using all proper means in endeavouring to arrest the progress of drunkenness and the multiplication of public-houses, and to discourage drinking customs. The Assembly also recommend that every minister of the Free Church should preach a sermon on temperance on a day to be named by the Presbytery to which he belongs, and all Presbyteries are enjoined to name such a day, with a view to ministers warning their congregations against the insidious evils of drunkenness ; and Presbyteries are commanded to see that this is attended to.” In submitting the motion, he suggested that the committees on temperance and several cognate subjects, the reports on which were generally submitted to a very thin House, should be combined in future ; and the reports being taken up collectively would thereby, he thought, secure a greater amount of attention on the part of the members.

Dr CANDLISH seconded the motion. He thought that if they left the charge of the Sabbath question, and the temperance question, and one or two more in the line of religion and morals, in the hands of the one committee, they would find the voice of the Supreme Court of the Church, when called upon to take up any of the subjects in cases of emergency, would be more influential than it is as these matters are at present managed. He thought, however, that to remit all these matters to the committee on religion and morals would not be practicable at present, or perhaps for a year, though it was a change which should be kept in view by the Assembly. With reference to the special sermon on temper-

ance, he thought that the best way of carrying out that suggestion would be to enjoin Presbyteries to fix a day on which all the ministers within the bounds should preach sermons on the subject.

Dr G. G. BROWN, (elder,) Aberdeen, spoke of the great mortality which occurred in the army in India from intemperance; and expressed a hope that the Church would do all in its power to discourage the drinking customs of the country.

Mr DAVID DICKSON, (elder,) Edinburgh, referred to the evils of the liquor traffic in cities and large towns, and said he believed these evils might be greatly diminished if magistrates, town councillors, and justices of the peace were more alive to the duty that rested on them, of giving their assistance for obtaining a reduction of the number of public-houses.

Mr BREMNER, Glasgow, thought that the Assembly, in considering this subject, should direct its attention to the root of the evil, and determine the important question—What should be done with the drunkard-maker? As long as it was considered quite reputable for a man to be the keeper of a dram shop, from which no good—nothing but evil—could emanate, it would be difficult for the magistrates or others to reduce the number of public-houses. So long as the keepers of what the late Mr M'Cheyne of Dundee called these “dens of iniquity and gates to hell,” were received not only into full communion, but into the offices of elders and deacons of the Church, it would be very difficult to adduce any very valid argument to the magistrates or others for the suppression of these houses. A great deal might be done in the way of preventing publicans from obtaining admission into the Church. He knew ministers who found no difficulty in so dealing with the consciences of publicans, when applying for admission to the communion in their congregations, that, having had once an interview with them, they never applied again—they never came back to the kirk-session with their certificates, but were satisfied with the intercourse they had already had with the minister. When such individuals were asked whether they were serving God or a different master, in carrying on the work of a publican, and whether in the morning they could ask God to send them customers during the day, the effect was generally such that they never after that sought for admission into that minister's congregation; if that were more generally done than it is, it would keep the communion rolls of the congregations clearer than they are of such members; and if any person became a publican after being placed on the roll of membership, there were various ways, without having recourse to direct subjection to discipline, in which he might be brought to reconsider the position in which he had placed himself. He thought, on the whole, that the Church might do a great deal more than it had hitherto done for the promotion of temperance in the country; and he hoped they would soon be induced to take some more decided action in the matter.

After a few remarks from Dr LONGMUIR, the report was, along with the suggestion of Dr Candlish as to the special sermon on the subject, unanimously adopted.

APPOINTMENT OF COMMITTEES.

Mr KELMAN, St John's, Leith, laid on the table the report (No. XXXVI.) of the committee on committees, which was appointed at last Assembly

to consider the principle on which the standing committees of the Church are appointed.

Mr Kelman, in referring to the report, said—The subject, of which this report treats, is one of very great importance. The power which the committees wield in our Church is a great and a growing power, and therefore it is exceedingly desirable that the composition of the committees should be such that they would fairly and fully represent the general mind of the Church. The committee, whose report I now submit to the Assembly, was appointed last year to consider the principle according to which the standing committees of the Church are appointed, and to report to this Assembly. The committee have held five meetings, at which they were engaged in considering that principle, and now they beg to lay the report upon your table. The report may be said to consist of three parts. The first part gives the previous legislation on the subject; the second, the present state of matters; and the third, suggestions of improvements for the future. With respect to the present state of matters, your committee, instead of looking at the principle of appointment simply in the abstract, have dealt with it as it actually manifests itself in practice. When viewed in that aspect, the present mode of appointment appears to your committee to be liable to serious objection in two points.

First, The suggesting of names for any given committee has hitherto lain with the convener and the members of that committee. And, since this is so, it is natural that the names suggested should, generally speaking, be those of persons within the circle of their acquaintanceship, while the services of many others, who are both able and willing to render effective aid in carrying on the business of the Church, but who happen to lie beyond that circle, and are too modest to push themselves forward, are lost to the Church. Hence there has resulted a very unequal distribution of influence over the Church. Take a single example. There is in Fifeshire a Presbytery containing eight congregations, which has four of its ministers members of the Sustentation Fund committee. That small Presbytery has as many representatives on that important committee as the Presbytery of Paisley, and the Presbytery of Greenock, and the Presbytery of Stirling, and the Presbytery of Linlithgow, all together; or half as many as the Presbytery of Glasgow with its somewhere about sixty congregations.

Secondly, A person, once appointed, if only he gives a tolerable attendance at the meetings of the committee, may continue on the committee for an indefinite length of time. It is not necessary that he should ever be of any use in carrying on the business of the committee, or that he should even speak a single word. His mere bodily presence secures his continuance on the committee. If you examine the lists of the members of committees, you will find that in several parts of the country there are persons, of whom it may without disparagement be said that they are not more highly qualified for the work of the committees than many others who might be named, and that they have no more right to be on the committees than those others, and yet they are continued fifteen, seventeen, or twenty years on committees, while the others never get an opportunity to render their services at all.

But perhaps it may be objected to what has been said respecting the continuance of members on the committees, that each Assembly ap-

points its own committees, and that each committee is appointed only for a year. To this I reply, that that is true in theory, but does not affect the practical working of the plan, which is as has been stated; and that, when viewed under that aspect, the present mode of appointing the committees is still more unsatisfactory than when viewed under the other; for, in this aspect of the matter, the committee of any given year not only suggest the names of the new members who are to be associated with them, but actually recommend themselves, as, along with these, the most suitable persons they know for the work of the committee.

For these and other reasons, then, your committee are of opinion that the present mode of appointing committees is unsatisfactory. And to my certain knowledge there exists outside the committee a wide-spread and deep-seated feeling of dissatisfaction—a feeling which is of the nature of an under-current, and therefore has not obtruded itself upon notice, but which, from what I have learned during the past year, I find is far stronger and broader than I was aware of when last year I gave notice of motion for the appointment of a committee.

But perhaps it may be said, “It is impossible to improve the state of matters: an attempt was made some years ago, and turned out to be a failure.” To that my reply is, that the plan never got a fair and full trial. The most important part of it was the principle of rotation. Now I have been given to understand that in one of the committees there were for a time some partial endeavours to carry out the principle of rotation. Perhaps there may have been similar endeavours in some of the other committees. But one has only to cast his eye over the lists of the various years to see that the plan never got anything like a full trial. If it is alleged that the cause of this was, that those in charge of matters did not know how to carry out the principle of rotation, I acknowledge the difficulty, but venture to think that it was the duty of those in charge of matters to come to the Assembly for instructions at the first opportunity.

Your committee are of opinion that the present state of matters is susceptible of much improvement, and therefore they lay before you the proposals which you will find in pages three and four of the report. The two leading features of the plan proposed by the committee are—(1.) The principle of rotation; and (2.) A committee of selection, acting in harmony with the conveners, and in communication with the Presbyteries.

In the first clause of suggestions it is proposed that the standing committees of the Church shall have each a *fixed number* of members. This proposal contains a principle which is exemplified in business every day. It is also necessary to the carrying out of the principle of rotation mentioned in suggestion 2.

In the second clause it is proposed that the number of members in each committee shall, generally speaking, be smaller than at present. There are certain advantages resulting from having large committees; but there are also very great disadvantages. With large committees many, instead of *doing* anything themselves, have simply to be spectators or witnesses of what is done by others. And then there is the matter of expense. With very large committees, and with the members of them spread over various districts of the country, the travelling ex-

penses connected with attendance at meetings of committees would become a very serious burden on the funds of the Church. And then, further, there is the overlapping of the various committees. On account of the great size of the committees, it happens that the same individual has to be on a great number of committees, and often finds it physically impossible to attend them all. At the meetings of our committee I frequently heard gentlemen say that they should have been present at three, sometimes at four, other committees at the same hour. I may mention also that at present there are two respected brethren who are upon ten committees each, one who is on fourteen, one on eighteen, one on nineteen, one on twenty-two, and one on twenty-four.

In suggestion 2 it is proposed that a principle of rotation should be carried out, one-fifth part of the members retiring annually in order. That particular proportion was fixed on with a view to the avoiding of two extremes: on the one hand, the monopoly or the excessive centralisation of the administrative influence of the Church, to which there is a tendency when the committees are composed of the same individuals for an indefinite length of time; and, on the other hand, the inefficiency in conducting the business of the Church that would arise if the members had to retire from committees shortly after they had acquired the amount of acquaintance with the work of the committees necessary for enabling them to be useful in carrying on the business. Your committee are of opinion that the term of five years avoids both these extremes.

It is proposed that this rule shall apply to conveners as well as to ordinary members—that is, the conveners, at the end of five years, shall, like the other members, cease to be members, and therefore also cease to be conveners. Sometimes it might be very desirable that the same con- vener, or some of the members, should be continued after the expiry of the five years; and this is provided for in the last clause, “If the Assembly shall see fit, any retiring member may be re-appointed.” Sometimes a person whose name has been put upon a committee may fail to attend; and this contingency is provided for in clause (b) of the suggestion.

Thus much for the principle of rotation. But that principle needs something to carry it into operation. The weak point of the former plan lay in this, that it did not provide any machinery for that purpose. The machinery proposed by your committee now is described in suggestions 3, 4, 5, and 6.

Suggestion 3 recommends the appointment of a committee of a selection, in which ministers of various standings, as regards their date of ordination, shall be fairly represented; and marks out the work which that committee shall have to perform, viz., to find out and nominate to the Assembly for appointment suitable persons to serve on the several committees.

Suggestion 4 provides that in making their selection this committee shall communicate with the conveners of the respective committees; for it is intended that the new committee shall act, not in opposition to the conveners, but in harmony with them, with a view to the most effective conducting of the business of the Church. It also provides that the *Presbyteries* of the Church shall be requested to furnish the committee with the names of persons whom they would recommend for appointment, thus securing that those who, in their own *Presbyteries*,

have manifested administrative talent or a capacity for business, shall be brought forward with a view to their being appointed to the committees of the Church.

Suggestion 5 indicates the principles by which the proposed committee shall be regulated in making their selection. The object in view is not the mere carrying out of a theory, but the effective conducting of the business of the Church. Accordingly the committee shall have regard (1,) to fitness for the work of the particular committee for which the persons are to be nominated. But it is desirable to have the various districts of the country fairly represented. It is not intended that from *every* part of the country there should be persons on all the committees. In some cases the distance is so great, or the means of locomotion are so defective, that it would be altogether unreasonable to expect ministers to come and attend committees. Still there is a large area within which these difficulties do not exist, and within that area it is desirable that there should be as equable a distribution of influence as possible.

Hitherto persons have often been nominated without their knowledge. Many have told me that the first time they had any idea of being appointed to a committee was when they saw their names in the Daily Proceedings. In such cases it often happened that the likings of the individual did not lie in that particular direction, or their other arrangements did not admit of their attending the meetings of committee; and so, after a year's non-attendance, their names had to be struck off. To meet this difficulty, it is provided that, previously to recommending any person for appointment as a new member of any committee, the Committee of Selection shall ascertain the person's willingness to undertake and to perform the work for which he is to be nominated.

Such is the proposal of your committee. Its two great leading features are, the principle of rotation, and a Committee of Selection acting in harmony with the conveners and in communication with the Presbyteries. Neither of these features is a novelty. The principle of rotation was, after three years' consideration, formally adopted by the Assembly in 1860 without a dissenting voice; and the appointment of a committee for carrying out the principle of rotation was proposed and earnestly urged by Principal Cunningham in the last Assembly before his death. A committee for the same purpose exists in the United Presbyterian Church, and, since its appointment, has given great satisfaction. What your committee aimed at was not the bringing forward of something new, nor the carrying out of a theory, beautiful perhaps in itself, but altogether unfit for use, but the producing of something practical, something that would work, and that would combine efficiency in conducting the business of the Church with an equitable and fair distribution of influence over the Church.

That the scheme proposed is perfect, I do not for a moment imagine. That it is fitted to accomplish the object which the committee had in view, I thoroughly believe. And I would say of it, what Dr Buchanan in his noble speech on Wednesday said of his new scheme about the Sustentation Fund, "That the scheme should be looked at all round, is not what I deprecate; it is what I earnestly desire. But I do deprecate that hyper-criticism that exhausts its ingenuity in picking holes and finding faults; and not less do I deprecate that utopian criticism which, because the scheme is not a panacea, fitted infallibly to cure every pos-

sible existing or imaginable ill to which our present system is liable, at once decries it, and declares with oracular voice that it is nought."

On the motion of Mr WILSON, the Assembly adopted the following deliverance:—"The Assembly approve of the suggestions contained in the report, in so far as to find that the number of members of standing committees shall be in proportion to the importance of the work they have to perform, and shall, generally speaking, be fewer than at present, and that one-fifth of the members of each committee shall retire annually in order of rotation, and members who shall have been absent without cause shown from three-fourths of the meetings of the committee on which they are appointed to serve, shall, *ipsa facto*, cease to be members. Those members who retire by rotation may be re-elected by the General Assembly. Further, the General Assembly invite Presbyteries, not later than the month of March next year, to send to conveners of standing committees the names of such persons, ministers or elders, as they wish to recommend for the service of such committees. The Assembly re-appoint the committee for further consideration of the matter, and instruct them to report to next Assembly."

THE CHURCH MANUAL.

An overture from the Synod of Moray, requesting the Assembly to see that the Manual of Church Procedure be completed, and published without further delay, having been read,

Sir HENRY MONCREIFF stated that a proof of the "Manual" was now in the hands of members of Assembly, which was a sufficient reply to the overture, (No. XXXVIII.) He regretted that the committee had not been able to send out a proof of chapter V., as of the others. They had found no time for attending to the suggestions sent, and, at the same time, completing chapter V. They had succeeded in getting the whole text completed. And now a thorough revisal was needed, with the addition of marginal titles and appendices. He asked the Assembly to comply with the recommendation of the report.

Dr CANDLISH remarked that the amount of labour Sir Henry had had with the "Manual" had been very great, and he moved that the Assembly agree to his proposal. (Applause.)

The motion was agreed to, and this deliverance adopted:—"The Assembly approve of the report, record their thanks to the committee, especially to the convener, reappoint the committee, with Sir H. W. Moncreiff as convener, enjoin upon them to transmit chapter V. in proof to ministers, previously to the meeting of commission in August, to have the whole work, with the appendices, completed and thoroughly revised, previously to the meeting of commission in March 1868, and instruct the commission, at that meeting, if they find this requirement complied with, to direct the committee, if they see cause, as to the steps to be taken for enabling the General Assembly of 1868 to authorise its publication, if they see cause."

FORMS OF PROCESS.

Sir HENRY MONCREIFF stated that so much time and attention had been requisite in the preparation of the "Manual" that little had yet been done in regard to the "Forms of Process." He asked the Assembly to reappoint the committee.—Agreed.

GAELIC SCRIPTURES.

Dr M'LAUCHLAN gave in the report of the committee on the Gaelic Scriptures, which gave a satisfactory account of the progress which had been made during the past year.

Rev. Mr CAMPBELL, Petty, would take this opportunity to bring before the Assembly, in connexion with the report just laid on the table, the desirableness of having *marginal references* in the forthcoming edition of the Gaelic Scriptures. The difficulty which lay in the way of the Gaelic-speaking population in their desire to search the Scriptures, could not well be estimated by their more favoured neighbours of the south. Of his two hundred thousand fellow-countrymen he would venture to say that not one in a hundred had ever seen a concordance. We have our Scotts, our Bagsters, and our Crudens, but they have no aid whatever, they must depend solely on their memory. He did not propose to introduce such voluminous references as the Bibles just named contained, but some aid in that direction, which could be easily supplied by taking one of our own ordinary reference Bibles as the model. The only objection which he had heard against this proposal was on the ground of expense. Now it could not be denied that the adoption of this proposal would be attended with some expense—perhaps, however, not so much as some thought. But, he would ask, did not this objection lie against giving the Scriptures at all as well as in the way of what he was just saying, and if the design of the committee be, as it manifestly was, to give the word of life to Gaelic-speaking populations in the most accurate manner they could, surely this small but valuable aid to its intelligent perusal ought not, on the ground of expense, to be denied.

Dr CANDLISH said he had no doubt the object contemplated would be gained by the matter being thus brought before the Assembly. He moved that the Assembly approve of the report, and reappoint the committee—which was agreed to.

DIFFUSION OF KNOWLEDGE OF PRESBYTERIAN PRINCIPLES.

Dr GIBSON, in the absence of Dr Begg, convener, submitted the report of the committee in regard to the diffusion of a knowledge of the principles of Presbyterian Church government, (No. XXIII.)

An overture from the Presbytery of Edinburgh suggested that special attention should be drawn to the subject when the collection for pre-Disruption ministers was made.

Dr CANDLISH moved the following deliverance :—“The Assembly approve of the report, record their thanks to the committee, especially to the convener, reappoint the committee, and adopt the suggestion contained in the overture, viz., That on the occasion of the collection to be made for ante-Disruption Fund, ministers shall direct the special attention of their people to the scriptural authority of Presbyterian government; and the General Assembly hereby instruct ministers accordingly. Further, the General Assembly remit to the committee for their consideration the suggestions contained in the appendix to the present report.”

Dr WOOD, Dumfries, seconded the motion—which was agreed to.

REFUSAL OF SITES.

Mr BROWN DOUGLAS gave in the report of the committee on the refusal of sites. “Among the cases which, although now diminishing, still

unfortunately remain to be dealt with by the committee, the principal one as regards hardship and intolerance is that of Shieldag, in the Presbytery of Lochcarron, now a sanctioned charge. Vice-chancellor Sir John Stuart persistently disregards the request and the right of his tenants and neighbours to acquire a piece of ground for the erecting of a church. They continue faithful to their principles, and worship in large numbers Sabbath after Sabbath, when the weather is fine, in the open air, and when unable to do so, as many as the school can contain go to it for worship.

“Public opinion, which exercised a beneficial influence in so many other places where at one time sites were refused, has had no perceptible effect on the mind of Vice-Chancellor Sir John Stuart, though it is believed he will not be justified or defended by a single person who is acquainted with the circumstances of the case.

“There are other cases which have less the appearance of persecution than that of Shieldag. In these the congregations have not so many miles to travel in order to get to some place of worship; still by the refusal of sites, by the harsh stipulations attached when sites are granted, the committee see that the great work of the Free Church, in seeking to provide gospel ordinances for her own people, and to carry on its mission among the outlying population, is sadly hindered.

“For example, Kemnay is a sanctioned charge; the mass of the congregation resides from two to three miles from any Free Church place of worship; and the proprietor of the ground in the neighbourhood, though himself a Dissenter, and taking advantage of the toleration permitted to him, yet refuses the unanimous request of the Presbytery of Garioch for ground whereon to build a church for the people over whom they are placed. In Aboyne, again, the Presbytery of Kincardine-O’Neil have approved of the Free Church being removed from the south side of the Dee, where there are scarcely any inhabitants, to the vicinity of the village, which is the centre of the population. But they report to this committee that in consequence of conditions attached to the kind of buildings to be erected, by the proprietor, who reserves the right of veto, they have not yet been able to secure an available site, although there is ample ground to be feued for other purposes.

“There are one or two other causes which it seems necessary to specify; in these, as well as in the last mentioned case, Aboyne, the committee have not had the opportunity of conferring with the proprietors referred to in the representations which have been brought before the committee; and they cannot but hope that, as in other cases, a little explanation may have the effect of removing difficulties and objections which proprietors of ground applied for may entertain. The committee, however, deeply regret with the whole Church the evil and inconvenience which congregations so much feel from the refusal of sites—in the few cases of such refusal that still remain. The opportunity has not seemed favourable for bringing this subject under the consideration of Parliament, by petition or otherwise; but possibly when the minds of politicians are less occupied than at present by the great changes in the constitution which are now being discussed, there may be a more fitting occasion for asking the attention of Parliament, and, through Parliament, of the country, to an acknowledged grievance for which some remedy should be provided.”

Dr CANDLISH, in moving the adoption of the report, said they must be all sorry to hear of the continued persecution for so long a time of the congregation of Shieldag. It was, at the same time, most gratifying to know of their continued adherence to the principles of the Free Church. With reference to the other cases mentioned, Mr Burnett of Kemnay is a gentleman who seems to glory in being a persecutor, a fact which is all the more extraordinary, he himself being, as the convener remarked, a Dissenter, and availing himself of the law of toleration. It is very desirable to get public opinion to tell upon such men as these, though he thought the convener was quite right when he suggested that it would not be wise, and this was not exactly the time to bring the matter before Parliament and the public. He hoped, however, that the time would soon come when they should have these cases thoroughly ventilated in the House of Commons; and he thought that even Sir John Stuart could scarcely stand a full exposition of the case in which he is concerned without feeling ashamed. (Hear, hear.)—The report was unanimously adopted.

MARRIAGE LAWS.

No report from this committee was given in. An overture from the Synod of Moray was read, but no one appeared to support it. The Assembly passed from the overture and discharged the committee.

COLLEGE COMMITTEE.

The report of the College Committee was submitted to the Assembly by Dr HENDERSON, (No. V.)

On the motion of Professor DOUGLAS, this deliverance was adopted:—“The General Assembly approve of the report, and record their thanks to the committee, especially to the convener. The Assembly learn with regret that there is still a serious burden of debt upon the college buildings both at Edinburgh and at Glasgow, and they commend this subject to the consideration of the liberal members and friends of the Church.”

EXAMINATION BOARD.

The report of the Board of Examiners was given in by Dr CANDLISH. The Assembly approved generally of the proposal submitted by the Board, that so much of the exit examination as embraces the studies of the first three years of the Theological Course be taken at the beginning of the fourth session, and the remainder at the close of that session; and authorised the Board, with consent of the principals and professors of the three colleges, to make arrangements, if possible, before next session, for carrying the proposal into effect in the session ensuing. Further, the Assembly authorised the Senatus of the New College, Edinburgh, to make such changes in the order of curriculum as may be needful for bringing the studies of the three first sessions to be the same in all the three colleges.

MONDAY, JUNE 3, 1867.

REPLY TO THE ASSEMBLY'S LOYAL ADDRESS.

The MODERATOR—Before the Assembly proceed to the business of the day, I have to read the following communication from Mr Gathorne Hardy, Her Majesty's Secretary of State for the Home Department :—

“ Whitehall, 1st June 1867.

“ SIR,—I have had the honour to lay before the Queen the loyal and dutiful address which accompanied your letter of the 27th ultimo, from the ministers and elders of the Free Church, on the occasion of the return of Her Majesty's Birthday ; and I beg to inform you that Her Majesty was pleased to receive the address very graciously.

“ I am, your obedient servant,

“ GATHORNE HARDY.

“ Rev. John Roxburgh,

“ Moderator of the Free Church.”

THE UNION DIVISION AGAIN.

Dr GIBSON—I do not know whether I am quite in order in referring to the minutes now, but I did not care to interrupt the reading of that document. I wish to call attention to the fact as to what was stated on Saturday and freely admitted—that Dr Duff did not vote on Friday—that not the slightest notice has been taken of that, or my own resignation as a member of committee, among other resignations, in the public newspaper that is ordinarily supposed to report our proceedings. Of course this is not the place to find fault with newspapers, but I wish to make the remark that no notice has been taken of this in the minutes. In the Assembly of 1841, in the case of Mr Macdonald Swan, a similar omission occurred, and on Mr Macgill Crichton bringing it before the Assembly, it was corrected in the minutes.

Sir H. W. MONCREIFF—I wish to say something on this point. The names of parties voting are not put in the minute or record. They are merely published in the Proceedings for the information of members, but we do not in any case put in the names of parties voting in the minute. I do not know what was done in the Assembly of 1841 ; but it would be very awkward to put in the minute a correction of what you did not authenticate at all. The only remedy is a statement made publicly ; and then it might be stated in a note at the end of the Daily Proceedings, but you cannot put it in the minute.

Dr CANDLISH—It was understood that this would be done on Saturday, but it was omitted *per incuriam*. Of course it can be done to-day.

Dr GIBSON—That quite answers my purpose, if it be inserted in the Proceedings. I may be allowed to say that there was a material difference in the two cases. Sir Henry Moncreiff has mentioned that these names were not entered in the record, neither were they in the Assembly of 1841. But in that Assembly there was not any formal document issued by the House. Here there is a formal document with the names. What has been stated, however, meets altogether what I wished, except that there are other grave omissions in the report that is understood to form the foundation of our Blue-Book. But this is not the time to say anything about that.

A PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr CHARLES COWAN—Moderator, allow me to tender an apology for the few remarks which fell from me on Saturday. When I heard the gratifying communication received by Dr Buchanan, my first feeling was one of regret that it had not been received sooner, as it might have mitigated the intensity of the opposition, and possibly influenced the division that took place. I felt great regret that our excellent friends, Drs Begg and Gibson, were both absent on the occasion, seeing they had protested against the decision of the House upon the union question, and was not in their places the night before. I confess I had, without the slightest wish to say anything that could be regarded as offensive, a great wish at the moment that, as members of the House, they should be, without delay, informed of what had taken place, conveyed to us by the Atlantic Telegraph. In what I said I committed an indiscretion. I did not require to be told by Dr Candlish that it was a breach of order. It was a breach of propriety, and it would have been a most undignified course for this House to adopt whatever the impulse of the moment I proposed. (Hear.) Let me further say, that my first impulse—though I did not know till this morning that one member of the Assembly considered my words an insult—was to write both these gentlemen and express my regret. I am very glad to see Dr Gibson here, and I now tender to him, *in foro Ecclesie*, my expression of personal regret in regard to the few words I used, the utterance of which I regret exceedingly. I am very sorry to learn, as the whole House will be, that Dr Begg is detained at home by indisposition. But allow me to say that, however much I deplore the division upon the union question, I never had the slightest doubt as to the thorough honesty, and as little as to the manliness of the course, which these reverend gentlemen chose to take. I respect the manliness and courage of these gentlemen, and I am quite sure that they have acted from a regard to the best interests of the Church. (Hear, hear.) I hope the apology which I now tender will be received by my excellent friend Dr Gibson in the spirit in which it is given. (Hear, hear.)

Dr GIBSON—I at once accept the apology, and tender my thanks to Mr Cowan for the frank way in which he has made it. (Hear, hear.)

Sir H. W. MONCREIFF—One word about these resignations not being recorded in the minute. They will come into the minute as soon as we come to the point of appointing a committee.

Dr GIBSON—Certainly; I know that. It was merely that there was no report in the public papers.

Captain SHEPHERD—I beg to tender my thanks to Mr Cowan for what he has now said. I do think that this is a subject upon which none of us can think or speak with levity. I have been a member of Assembly now for upwards of thirty years—five years in the Established Assembly, and in this Assembly since the Disruption, and I may say I never voted with more pain and regret, or with the feeling that more serious consequences were likely to follow the vote than upon this occasion. I trust it will be marked by all the members of this House, whatever their opinions may be, as a very serious vote indeed.

The subject then dropped.

CASE OF DISPUTED PROPERTY AT ECCLEFECHAN.

The Assembly named the following members, who were appointed by the commission as a committee to watch over the case of disputed property at Ecclefechan, to be a committee of this Assembly for the same purpose, viz., Sir Henry Moncreiff, Dr Begg, Dr Candlish, Mr Walter Wood—ministers. Mr Patrick Dalmahoy and Mr George Meldrum—elders. Mr Meldrum to be convener.

SALES AND TRANSFERENCES OF PROPERTY.

The Assembly called for the report of the committee on sales and transferences of property, which was given in by Mr Dalmahoy, the convener. The Assembly approved of the report, and, in accordance therewith,

In the case of the application from the Deacons' Court of the Free Church at *Wolfee*, with the unanimous concurrence of the congregation and unanimous sanction of the Presbytery of the bounds and of the trustees of the Church, the General Assembly authorise the exchange of the present site of the church for another piece of ground which affords a more suitable site—the materials of the present building being to be used in the construction of the new church as far as possible, and the requirements and provisions of the Act VIII. of the Assembly of 1863 anent sales and transferences of property being always observed.

In the case of the application from the Deacons' Court of the *first Free Church congregation at Thurso*, with the unanimous concurrence of the congregation and of the Presbytery of the bounds, the General Assembly authorise the trustees vested in the property, and the Deacons' Court, to sell the present place of worship and school-house, with the ground on which they are built, and to apply the proceeds to the erection of a new place of worship and school-house, in proportion to the relative value of the present buildings, the requirements and provisions of the Act VIII. of the Assembly of 1863 anent sales and transferences of property being always observed.

In the case of the application from the Deacons' Court of the Free Church at *Bridge of Weir*, Paisley, parties were called but did not appear. The General Assembly, with the unanimous concurrence of the congregation and the unanimous recommendation of the Presbytery of the bounds, grant permission to sell the manse and grounds connected with it to the Greenock and Ayrshire Railway Company, on such terms as the Court and congregation may consider satisfactory, it being understood that the price is to be applied to the erection of a new manse, the requirements and provisions of the Act VIII. of the Assembly of 1863 anent sales and transferences of property being always observed.

In the case of the application of the general trustees, with reference to the property of the congregation at *Stenness*, as it appears that in the peculiar circumstances stated in the petition, there is at present a probability of selling the school-house and schoolmaster's house to advantage, which may never occur again, the General Assembly authorise the general trustees to sell the above buildings and a small piece of the adjoining ground, as prayed for in the said petition, at the best price that can be obtained for them, on the understanding that the price is to be applied in the manner set forth in the petition. But the sale shall not be carried

into effect until the congregation shall have an opportunity of expressing their concurrence in it.

CASES OF STUDENTS.

The Assembly called for the report of the committee on cases of students and probationers, which was given in by Dr Murray Mitchell, the convener. The Assembly approved of the report, and in accordance therewith,

In the case of *Mr William P. de Villiers*, who, after a regular attendance of four years in the Theological College of the Dutch Reformed Church in South Africa, has attended as a fourth year's student in the New College, Edinburgh, and passed the examination by the Board, and applies for leave to be taken on trial for license, the General Assembly, on the report of their committee, with acquiescence of parties, grant the application, and authorise the Presbytery of Edinburgh to take him on trial for license, according to the rules of the Church.

In the case of *Mr James Thomson*, who petitions that his name be enrolled in the list of students who have completed the third year, though he did not offer himself for examination by the Board in 1864, and did so in 1865, (when he passed the examination,) explanation having been given as to the point of difficulty which occurred last year, the General Assembly, on the report of their committee, with acquiescence of parties, considering the circumstances, grant the prayer of the petition.

In the case of *Mr Angus M'Iver*, whose class certificates were regularly brought before the Free Presbytery of Lewis, with a view to his being taken on trial for license, and were sustained, but through inadvertence on the part of the clerk of Presbytery, were not laid before the Synod, and cannot now be laid before it till next April, as the Synod of Glenelg meets only once a year, the General Assembly, on the report of their committee, with acquiescence of parties, considering the circumstances, grant the prayer of the petition, and authorise the Presbytery of Lewis to take Mr M'Iver on trial for license.

In the case of *Mr J. K. Craig*, who has attended all the classes of the curriculum of arts during three sessions, except the class of natural philosophy, and petitions to be allowed to appear before the Examination Board with a view to entering the Divinity Hall, engaging to attend the class of natural philosophy during one or other of his sessions at the hall, his intention being to return, as soon as possible, to preach the gospel in New Zealand, where he has already spent several years, the General Assembly, on the report of their committee, with acquiescence of parties, considering the circumstances, grant the prayer of the petition, and authorise the board of examination accordingly.

In the case of *Mr H. F. Luckhoff*, who, after regularly attending the theological classes at Utrecht and Erlangen for a period exceeding the length of three sessions of our theological curriculum, has attended as a fourth year's student, in the New College, Edinburgh, and has passed the examination by the Board, and applies to be taken on trial for license, with a view to proceeding to South Africa, the General Assembly, on the report of their committee, with acquiescence of parties, grant the application, and authorise the Presbytery of Edinburgh to take him on trial for license.

In the case of *Mr Gustav Radlof*, who, after regularly attending the

theological classes at Erlangen and Utrecht for a period exceeding the length of three sessions of the theological curriculum, has attended as a fourth year's student in the New College, Edinburgh, and passed the examination by the Board, and who applies to be taken on trial for license, with a view to proceeding to South Africa, the General Assembly, on the report of their committee, with acquiescence of parties, grant the application, and authorise the Presbytery of Edinburgh to take him on trial.

In the case of *Mr James Glendinning*, a probationer of the Reformed Presbyterian Church, applying to be received as a probationer of the Free Church, the General Assembly, on the report of their committee, with acquiescence of parties, find that the conditions of Act VIII. 1860, have been complied with, grant the application, and authorise the Presbytery of Dumfries to admit him as a probationer within their bounds.

COLLEAGUES AND SUCCESSORS.

The report from the committee on Colleagues and Successors was submitted by Mr Wilson. The Assembly received the report, and in accordance therewith agreed that the unexpended interest of the fund during the last two years be applied to meet the cases for which applications are now made.

Dr J. J. WOOD expressed his wish to make a remark. There were two classes of cases in the report; one of applications for colleagues and successors, the other of applications for unordained assistants. He had been under the impression that the grants from the Aged and Infirm Ministers' Fund were regulated by a scale, according to the time of service, fixed by the Assembly. He found, however, that this applied only to colleagues and successors, and that in the case of assistants it was left to the discretion of each Assembly to grant what appeared to them proper in the circumstances. Now, he was not quite sure that if he had adverted to this, he should have applied for a grant for an assistant, for he did not think it right, nor a position in which applicants should be placed, that the committee or the Assembly should have a discretion further than satisfying themselves that the applicants were really aged and infirm. When that point was established he thought the grant should be made according to a particular scale; and he did not object to it being a lower scale than in the case of colleagues and successors. He did not make these remarks with reference to any particular case, least of all to his own, but simply because aged ministers, or ministers enfeebled by indisposition, who had to come and say what will you give us in the circumstances, were put in a position that was not quite a right one.

Dr CANDLISH said there was a slight irregularity in raising the general question upon this report on individual cases, but once the report were disposed of, it would be quite in order to move on the general question.

CASE OF MR FRASER OF GORDON.

Mr FRASER did not acquiesce in the deliverance proposed by the committee. It appeared from the papers that owing to a loss of voice and a nervous affection Mr Fraser had become unable so to make himself heard by the congregation as to render his services in the pulpit generally edifying, and that under direction of assessors appointed by last Assembly

an arrangement had been made by which Mr Fraser was to pay an assistant £60 a year, he himself continuing to do pastoral work out of the pulpit, and retaining the use of the manse, while application would be made for a grant from the Aged and Infirm Ministers' Fund toward paying the assistant. On a memorial from the congregation, however, which came before the Presbytery on the 7th May, the Presbytery agreed to suggest to the Assembly that should it see fit to make Mr Fraser a grant of such an amount as £35, it be made a condition of the grant that Mr Fraser contribute as his part a like sum of £35 for the support of the preacher stationed at Gordon, and also give up, for the use of the preacher, the manse at Gordon.

The recommendation of the committee now was, in accordance with the Presbytery's suggestion, that the Assembly award a grant of £35 from the Aged and Infirm Ministers' Fund, subject to the conditions that the applicant gives up the manse to the assistant, and contributes £35 to him, in addition to the above grant.

Mr FRASER dissented from the conditions attached to the grant, and desired to be heard before the Assembly. Mr Fraser appeared for himself, and Mr Purves for the Presbytery.

Mr FRASER complained that by a decision of this question there would be laid upon him a burden not laid upon any one else in such circumstances—giving up his manse, which he had occupied for a number of years, and on which he had laid out money.

Mr PURVES said the Presbytery were satisfied that, owing to his being unable to make himself heard, and the style of his sermons, Mr Fraser could not conduct the service in a way to be edifying to the people. In other pastoral duties Mr Fraser was attentive and zealous, and the Presbytery had no wish to have him laid aside. But they were satisfied that only such a proposal as that made by the committee would secure the harmony and prosperity of the congregation.

Mr FRASER replied that the congregation was at most a small one, but the Presbytery had listened to a memorial from a small section of discontented individuals in it, and he felt sure that though granted, the arrangement would not be long satisfactory. A good deal of strong feeling had been expressed in the locality at the way in which it was proposed to treat him in this matter.

Dr GIBSON looked upon this case as forming an important precedent, and one that would be very dangerous to the Church, if the proposal in the report were sanctioned. A positive arrangement had been suggested before, and there had not been sufficient time to try it at any rate. Judging from Mr Fraser's speaking in that House, he did not think there could be much doubt about his being able to make himself heard by a small Berwickshire congregation. He moved that the arrangement which had been suggested should stand—the minister paying an assistant £60 and receiving a grant from the Aged and Infirm Ministers' Fund, but not giving up the manse.

Dr CANDLISH moved that the Assembly do not sustain the report, but continue the case until next General Assembly, appointing the same assessors as before. Dr Wood seconded.

Sheriff HERIOT seconded Dr Gibson's motion. After some conversation, Dr Caudlish withdrew his motion, and the following deliverance was unanimously adopted:—"The General Assembly do not approve of

the report in this case, but approve of Mr Fraser's application, and award a grant of £30 from the Aged and Infirm Ministers' Fund, to be paid in the meantime out of the unexpended interest of years 1865-66 and 1866-67; it being understood that, in accordance with an arrangement already made through the action of the Presbytery of Kelso and Lauder, aided by assessors, Mr Fraser will continue to pay the sum of £60 annually toward the support of an assistant."

HOME MISSION SCHEME.

Mr WILSON, Dundee, submitted the report, (No. III.) After some preliminary remarks, he said—The committee have had in prospect to send, as usual, early in the present month, evangelistic deputies to preach in the open air, from day to day, in localities and districts where there are multitudes of people living in utter ignorance and neglect of the ordinances of the Christian religion. I refer to this subject not for the purpose of explaining to the Assembly the nature of the work of these deputies, nor to call their attention to the singular blessing that has attended their labours in many places, formerly destitute, where we have now large and flourishing congregations, but for this reason, that we are suffering from the want of several deputies to labour in districts to which we have not found men to send. We are still open to receive offers, and will be most grateful, especially if some of the younger ministers of the Church will offer us their services during the summer months for this most important department of labour. There are three or four districts to which we had purposed to send deputies in this evangelistic labour, where, unless such offers reach us—unless we can get the services of a large number of ministers—we shall be obliged to leave the work during this summer undone. Perhaps the extent and variety of the work embraced within the province of our Home Mission and Church Extension Scheme is not sufficiently adverted to on the part of some of the congregations of our Church. Including ordained ministers and advanced students, we have, in connexion with the scheme, about two hundred paid agents employed in various localities of the country. We have our rural stations, we have our territorial missions in large towns, we have territorial churches in large towns, in their infancy, and we have Church extension charges scattered over the country, but still in their infancy, and requiring considerable aid from the funds of the committee. In fact, this Home Mission and Church Extension Scheme contains within itself a Church of very considerable magnitude. Indeed, the number of our Home Mission stations and the charges to which we pay grants is larger than the whole Presbyterian Church in connexion with us in England. This work has been sustained, and must still continue to be sustained, by a single annual collection made in the spring of every year. There is always a biennial collection for the evangelisation of the masses; and I must advert to this for a single moment, because this year it happens the collection is to be made in the month of August, and also for this reason, that while the collection annually made in April has been sufficient in amount to enable us to carry on our ordinary operations, this biennial collection is never more than half enough to meet the exigencies of the case. The collection made for the evangelisation of the masses is to meet expenses incurred by the committee in grants to ministers of territorial charges in large towns, and to meet the grants paid

to territorial mission stations in large towns which have not been sanctioned by the General Assembly. Our collection in August has never come up to £2500, and that is just the half of what is required for the demands made upon us. Were it not that the collection in April somewhat overlaps what we require for the maintenance of our ordinary stations and the payment of station grants, we would inevitably be in debt. In regard to our deputies, I am informed by one who has taken great and deep interest in the cause of our home missions, and has laboured with the most unprecedented success—Mr Howie, of Glasgow—that he wishes the attention of the Assembly and of the committee to be directed to a circumstance which is historical. A great many years ago, when the zeal of our Church was fresh and warm, we were wont, during the sittings of the Assembly, to pervade this city with open air preaching; and I trust next year this may be kept in view that we may revive the practice. Mr Howie tells me he preached in front of the Register Office, and that he never preached to an audience more interested or more deeply impressed; and I hope that at next Assembly we may get the aid of ministers from all parts of the country, so as to produce some effect by this agency in Edinburgh. One word as to the success which has attended the scheme, which has encouraged the members of the Church to prosecute it with increased vigour. Looking back over a period of ten years, and tracing the history of the Church during that period, I find that through the instrumentality of our home mission operations, about 80 charges have been added to the Free Church, with a membership of not less than 30,000. Thus, through the agency of this scheme we have added—from the masses of our large towns and mining districts—at the rate of 4000 a-year to the membership of the Church. That is a most gratifying and important result, worth far more than all the money the Free Church has hitherto expended upon it. It is only by the instrumentality of such an agency as is employed in connexion with the Home Mission and Church Extension Scheme that our Church can long continue to be really a national Church, embracing the great bulk of the population of this country, and keeping pace with the increase of the population. Apart from this work we would soon lag behind; the heathenism of the country would soon come to be making invasions of all kinds upon its professed Christianity. It is through this scheme that we take up arms to make war upon the heathenism of the land, and by the blessing of God to subdue the unreclaimed wastes and bring them under Christian culture. Besides, in connexion with this, it is not to be overlooked that God has in a very signal way blessed the work of the Free Church in connexion with this scheme. There has been a most blessed outpouring of the Spirit of God upon many of our churches, both in the rural districts and in large towns. Nor has this gracious work of the Spirit been withdrawn, for I believe that at this moment there are being elevated out of the lowest stratum of society many most hopeful and most earnest Christians. But we are not to look solely at the direct action of the scheme in reclaiming lost souls; we ought also to look to its healthful, invigorating influence upon the existing congregations of our Church. It is not the scheme of a committee of the Church operating upon one locality and another by agency paid directly by them and sustained by them; but not one of those mission stations has grown into vigour and health without engaging the

active and hearty energies of a very large proportion of the membership of our existing congregations. I believe there is no instrumentality at work within the bosom of our Church so fitted to keep alive and stir up the Christian zeal and energy of the membership of our Church as this Home Mission Scheme. It may be said that the scheme has arrived at such a condition, both of magnitude and organisation, that if we can sustain our present scheme of operations, if the Church furnishes us with means simply to carry it on, we can expect or desire little more. I would desire, however, to place under the notice of the Assembly one or two great *desiderata*—particularly this: in the history of the territorial mission charges in large towns, the mission reaches a certain stage of advancement in the course of a very few years, in which it becomes very much like any of our established congregations. That is to say, a considerable number of members are gathered, and, however poor or ragged and destitute they may have been, they are laid hold upon by our mission agency, they become clothed and in their right mind, and they are as respectable in outward appearance as our congregations generally are. This practically shuts the door against the access of those who are now in a state of nakedness and rags; and I believe it is essential to the progress of our territorial missions that special services should be held for men and women in their week-day clothes. Of necessity, therefore, it arises that the minister himself of a territorial charge must have three services on Sabbath, besides a multiplicity of week-day services, and the onerous burden of household visitation. All this overtaxes his strength, and if you are to sustain these mission churches in full vigour, every such minister would require an assistant to preach the third service and to labour in the work of visitation. We hear complaints of overtaxing work of the missionaries in the foreign field, but I fear we shall have a somewhat disastrous account of the overtaxed energies of some of our Home Mission agents; and there is nothing I would more delight in—and I am quite certain it would tell very much upon the progress of our scheme—than to offer aid to such charges as those I have referred to, which would enable them to continue the three full services on Sabbath, besides week-day services and household visitation, in full vigour. This has been again and again brought under the notice of the Home Mission committee, and I am quite sure that if all the cases were stated to the Assembly where the ministers feel overwhelmed by labouring in the unhealthy and confined closes of our large towns, the membership of the Church would be roused to contribute most liberally to the aid of ministers labouring under such circumstances. (Applause.)

Dr W. G. BLAIKIE, in moving the adoption of the report, said—It must be gratifying to the Assembly to know that the Home Mission Scheme continues to be attended with an encouraging measure of success in all the different branches of its operations. It has been said, and said truly, that growth is one of the best signs of vitality. I am sure there never was then a scheme that grew more rapidly than our Home Mission did a few years ago. At first the mission was limited to the single object of providing ordinances in districts where the number of adherents of our Church was too small to enable us to maintain an ordinary charge, but, by degrees, branch after branch has been added to the functions of the Home Mission. When it was resolved by the Church to take up the subject of territorial missions in earnest it was the Home Mission that

was required to attend to it ; when new charges required to be fostered, that could not be maintained in the ordinary way by the Sustentation committee, it was again the Home Mission that had the charge of such congregations committed to it ; when you determined to send forth deputies to spread the word of life in all parts of the country, and take possession of the highways and hedges, again you had recourse to the Home Mission committee ; when it was thought desirable that our students should be relieved from the duty of teaching, and provided with occupation more congenial to their future operations, once more the Home Mission committee were charged with the duty ; and when the construction of railways and other works of industry threw great masses of population suddenly upon particular districts, like sheep without a shepherd, again the Home Mission committee was required to look after them. It is very true that for the last few years we have not had any new branches added to this scheme, but I hope the Church will not allow the Home Mission committee to think of adopting for their motto, " Rest and be thankful ; " we shall rather, I hope, take for our motto, " Forgetting the things that are behind, and reaching forth unto those that are before. "

I should like to say a single word or two upon one branch, and one only, of the Home Mission operations—I mean our territorial work in large cities. I think there cannot be a doubt that the extraordinary growth of our large towns, the rapid accumulation of population there, is one of the most momentous and significant facts of the present time. It is almost like romance to be told that only two hundred years ago London was no larger than Glasgow at the present time, and that the inhabitants of Edinburgh were probably not so numerous as the present inhabitants of Leith. There were then only four towns in England where the population reached 10,000 souls. The state of things now is entirely changed. The population is crowding into particular districts and towns, and the great enterprise is laid upon the Churches of dealing with these masses of population, whose physical and moral and spiritual condition is so low, as, humanly speaking, to be almost hopeless. I do not deny that the rural parts of the country have their own social problems, but beyond doubt the condition of the masses in our large towns is the most important question before us at this time. Now, I do not hesitate to declare that the only instrumentality that seems thoroughly fitted for the work (in connexion, of course, with other agencies of a subordinate kind)—thoroughly fitted to lay a basis upon which you may rear the superstructure you desire—is the territorial scheme of Home Mission operations. And this is not a mere matter of theory. We have seen it exemplified ; we have seen the wilderness turned into the fruitful field ; we have seen the valley of dry bones become filled with an exceeding great army of living men.

Moderator, during the last few months a great deal of interest has been excited through England, and much discussion has taken place upon the subject of the marked and conspicuous alienation of the great mass of the working classes there from the services of the sanctuary. A great deal of discussion has taken place upon that point, and many things have been spoken of as likely more or less to remedy the evil which is so great and so glaring. I have read a great deal of what has been said and written upon it, and I have read it with two feelings—in the first place, with

thankfulness, that to a large degree, although I am sorry I cannot say altogether, the state of things deplored in England does not exist in Scotland; and in the next place, with the very firm conviction that our territorial missions, if carried on in the spirit of love and zeal, are adapted by God's blessing to remedy the evil among us so far as it does exist, and prevent it from spreading farther. I do not think it possible that that class of people can cherish the idea that the Christian Church is indifferent to them, and that they have got nothing to do with the Christian Church, when they see the Church actively and zealously engaged in such operations as have been carried on in some of the destitute districts of our large towns on this side the Border. In fact, I think we may say that during the last few years there has been—I speak of Edinburgh as knowing it best—a manifest improvement in the feeling of that class of the people in reference to religion. There have been added to the Free Church—as Mr Wilson informed us—about 30,000 members, in connexion with the Home Mission Scheme. During the last twelve or fifteen years, the number of communicants in connexion with the Free Church within the limits of the Presbytery of Edinburgh has increased from 15,000 to 20,000, being an increase of about 5000; and this increase, I believe, is in great measure owing to the new territorial charges. Besides this, the class of people referred to have now more of a home feeling in our Church in Edinburgh than they could have had previous to this movement.

I cannot but advert to another most important service of the territorial scheme, which has likewise been hinted at by the convener in his statement. The Home Mission has supplied work for many of the members of our older congregations. It has kept them from what is the greatest possible evil in a Church—stagnation—and has opened a field for the employment of their Christian talents; and not only so, but those members of our older congregations, when they have gone down to the poorer districts, and have had some experience of the kind of work to be done there, have received a loftier impression than before of the intense difficulty of this work, have been led to feel the utter inadequacy of human resources to the accomplishment of it, have been thrown more directly and earnestly upon the grace of God, have been led to pray more fervently for the outpouring of God's Holy Spirit to turn the wilderness into a fruitful field; and perhaps this has some connexion with the fact that it is upon many of these territorial congregations and districts that the shower of Divine blessing has mainly descended, while, at the same time, drops from heaven have fallen to refresh other congregations and other districts of our Church. And, then, there is this other fact: our territorial operations have led to a fuller development, a larger manifestation of the working ability of ordinary people in connexion with the Church of Christ. Mr J. H. Wilson stated, in last Assembly, that among those that are actively engaged in work in his congregation were many persons occupying the most ordinary spheres—mechanics, servants, and people who were not in the high social position, which previously we had been accustomed to think necessary before any one could undertake public work in the service of Christ. Some of the new congregations have taken the lead in this matter, and the reaction upon other congregations has been very beneficial. I read Mr M'Coll's book with feelings of humiliation to think that, whereas among those that have been picked up from

the lowest depths of society there is so much missionary energy and zeal, in congregations that are older and have longer enjoyed the benefits of Christian instruction, there is so much objection and unwillingness on the part of ordinary members even to think of doing anything in that direction. Last Saturday, in this hall, those of us who were present in connexion with the psalmody demonstration had very thrilling evidence how a little musical culture is capable of developing a great amount of talent in that particular direction. Twenty-five years ago, most likely, all that talent would have been folded up in a napkin and buried in the ground, and I could not help feeling on this occasion how much unused ability of various kinds—what an immense mass of unused and wasted power there is tied up in napkins within the congregations of our Church, and what a glorious thing it will be if the day shall come, as I pray it may come speedily, when this wasted power shall be consecrated to the advancement of God's glory. I think nothing is more glorious or triumphant than the vista that is opened up to us when we think of the time when all the members of our congregations who have any gifts shall be led to use them for the purpose of promoting the cause of Christ: then the Church will indeed be a crown of glory in the hands of the Lord, and a royal diadem in the hands of her God. I think our Church and people generally are coming to understand better the true character of that spirit which was expressed by him who asked—"Am I my brother's keeper?" It is an interesting thing to compare that word, as it stands recorded on one of the first pages of the Bible, with another word written on its last page—"And let him that heareth say, Come." It seems as if in these passages we had indications of the whole course over which the Bible may be said to take man. The Bible finds man where the fall placed him, murdering his brother, and sullenly asking his very judge, "Am I my brother's keeper?" And it does not leave him till it has brought him to a point indicated by such a passage as this: "And the spirit and the bride say, Come; and let him that heareth say, Come; and let him that is athirst come; and whosoever will, let him take the water of life freely." I have sometimes thought of these two passages as corresponding to the marks left by a self-registering thermometer, indicating at the one point the lowest degree of cold during the night, and at the other the highest degree of heat during the day. I pray that through the blessing of God upon our Home and Foreign Missions and upon our other schemes, our thermometer may show a rapid advance from the one point towards the other. (Applause.)

Mr CHARLES COWAN, (elder,) seconded the motion.

Professor GIBSON expressed his sympathy in the work of the Home Mission, and called attention to the necessity of some aid being given to the men engaged in the laborious work of territorial charges.

Dr JULIUS WOOD thought that the smaller towns, such as Dumfries, required to be as much attended to by the territorial missions as the great cities. In his own Presbytery—Dumfries—the work was going on prosperously, and by the close of the Assembly they expected to have four additional charges and a station. He trusted the Free Church would give them earnest help in this work.

After a few remarks from Mr STEEL, Dalry, who spoke of the importance of the work in mining districts, the report was unanimously adopted.

APPLICATIONS FOR COLLEAGUES AND SUCCESSORS.

The Assembly resumed consideration of the report of the committee on Cases of Colleagues and Successors.

In accordance therewith—in the case of *Mr Robert Kinnear*, minister at Moffat, applying for a colleague and successor, the General Assembly approve of the application, and award to him a grant of £40 from the Aged and Infirm Ministers' Fund, his stipend besides to be made up by the congregation to a sum equal to the equal dividend for the year, and not to fall below £140; the junior colleague to have a stipend not less than the equal dividend, and to benefit exclusively from any addition to be made from an increase of congregational funds.

In the case of *Mr David Mitchell*, minister at Calton, Glasgow, applying for a colleague and successor, the General Assembly approve of the application, and award to him a grant of £35 from the Aged and Infirm Ministers' Fund, to be paid in the meantime out of the unexpended interest of this fund in 1865-66 and 1866-67, the £60 from the Sustentation Fund to be made up by the congregation to a sum equal to the half dividend; the junior minister's stipend to be £200.

In the case of *Mr John Renton*, minister at Auchtermuchty, applying for a colleague and successor, the General Assembly approve of the application, and resolve that the grant of £35 from the Aged and Infirm Ministers' Fund already given to him to aid in obtaining the services of an assistant, be continued on his obtaining a colleague; the senior colleague to have, further, the usual sum from the Sustentation Fund; the junior colleague to have the usual sum from the Sustentation Fund, and, from the congregation a farther sum of £12, and, so long as he has not the manse, an additional sum of £20, in name of rent.

In the case of *Mr John Manson*, minister at Fyvie, applying for a colleague and successor, the General Assembly approve of the application, and award a grant of £60 from the Aged and Infirm Ministers' Fund, the usual sum from the Sustentation Fund, and £20 from the congregation in lieu of manse; the junior colleague to have, in this case, the manse and the usual sum from the Sustentation Fund, with a supplement from the congregation of not less than £10.

In the case of *Dr Robert Trail*, minister at Boyndie, applying for a colleague and successor, the General Assembly approve of the application, the senior minister to have the usual sum from the Sustentation Fund; the junior minister to have the usual sum from the Sustentation Fund, with the addition of £12 from the congregation, and £30 from the senior colleague, and also, in this case, the manse; the General Assembly award a grant of £35 from the Aged and Infirm Ministers' Fund, to be paid in the meantime out of the unexpended interest of years 1865-66 and 1866-67.

In the case of *Mr S. Campbell*, minister at Berriedale, applying for a colleague and successor, the General Assembly approve of the application, and award a grant of £50 from the Aged and Infirm Ministers' Fund, and the usual allowance from the Sustentation Fund; the junior colleague to have the usual allowance from the Sustentation Fund, a further grant of £20 from the congregational funds, and to have house accommodation provided for him while he has not the manse.

In the case of *Mr William Sinclair*, minister at Kirkwall, applying

for a colleague and successor, the General Assembly decline to entertain the application *hoc statu*; but looking to the whole circumstances of the case, as brought out in the papers, resolve to appoint assessors to act along with the Presbytery in maturing the application for final judgment, with instructions to report to the commission at any of its stated diets, and empowering the commission to determine on the case as they shall see cause.

In the case of *Dr Mackintosh Mackay*, minister at Tarbet, applying for a grant to aid in having an assistant, or a colleague and successor, the General Assembly approve of the alternative application for a colleague and successor, and award a grant of £70 from the Aged and Infirm Ministers' Fund; the senior colleague to have also the usual allowance from the Sustentation Fund; the junior colleague to have the usual sum from the Sustentation Fund, and from the congregation such farther sum as shall make up his stipend to £100, and to have the manse, in the event of its not being occupied by Dr Mackay.

In the case of *Dr J. J. Wood*, minister at Dumfries, applying for aid in employing an assistant, the General Assembly approve of the application, and award a grant of £50 from the Aged and Infirm Ministers' Fund, subject to the condition that the congregation raise a farther sum of £50.

In the case of *Mr J. Stark*, minister at Kilfinan, applying for aid in employing an assistant, the General Assembly approve of the application, and award a grant of £50 from the Aged and Infirm Ministers' Fund, subject to the condition that the congregation raise a farther sum of not less than £20.

In the case of *Mr John M^r Rae*, minister at Carloway, applying for aid in employing an assistant, the General Assembly approve of the application, and award a grant of £45 from the Aged and Infirm Ministers' Fund, subject to the condition that the congregation raise a farther sum of £20.

In the case of *Mr J. Sandison*, minister at Arbroath, applying for aid in employing an assistant, the General Assembly approve of the application, and award a grant of £40 from the Aged and Infirm Ministers' Fund, the congregation farther providing a sum of £50.

In the case of *Mr C. Nairn*, minister at Dundee, applying for aid in employing an assistant, the General Assembly approve of the application, and award a grant of £40 from the Aged and Infirm Ministers' Fund, the congregation farther providing a sum of not less than £60.

In the case of *Dr J. Roxburgh*, minister at Glasgow, applying for a grant from the Aged and Infirm Ministers' Fund, he already having a colleague, the General Assembly approve of the application, and award to him a grant of £50 from the Aged and Infirm Ministers' Fund, with the usual allowance from the Sustentation Fund, the colleague to have the remainder of the Sustentation Fund dividend, and such provision by the congregation as they have already agreed to make.

In the case of *Mr T. Gray*, minister at Inverurie, applying for aid in employing an assistant, the General Assembly approve of the application, and award a grant of £30 from the Aged and Infirm Ministers' Fund, to be paid, in the meantime, out of the unexpended interest of years 1865-66 and 1866-67.

In the case of *Mr R. Donald*, formerly at Sheuchan, applying for a

grant from the Aged and Infirm Ministers' Fund, and that the acting minister at Sheuchan shall receive the equal dividend from the Sustentation Fund, the General Assembly approve of the application, award a grant of £30 from the Aged and Infirm Ministers' Fund, to be paid, in the meantime, out of the unexpended interest of years 1865-66 and 1866-67, to Mr Donald, the allowance he at present draws from the Sustentation Fund being to that extent reduced, and resolve that the acting minister at Sheuchan receive in future the equal dividend.

In the case of *Mr Samuel Smith*, formerly minister at Borgue, applying for a grant from the Aged and Infirm Ministers' Fund, the General Assembly, in the want of a medical certificate or any evidence of infirmity, decline the application in the meantime, but authorise the commission, in August, to dispose of it, in the event of a medical certificate of infirmity being then produced.

In the case of *Mr Robert Lundin Brown*, Largo, applying for a grant from the Aged and Infirm Ministers' Fund, with the view of his retiring from his charge, the General Assembly, in the want of any medical certificate or evidence of infirmity, decline the application in the meantime, but authorise the commission, in August, to dispose of it, in the event of a medical certificate of infirmity being then produced.

ASSISTANTS.

It was unanimously agreed, that it be remitted to the committee on the Sustentation Fund to consider and propose a scale of grants to aged and infirm ministers on whose behalf application is made for a grant to aid in employing an unordained assistant, in the same way it is now done in the case of applications anent colleagues and successors.

REPORT ON PSALMODY.

Mr LIVINGSTON, Stair, gave in the report of the committee on Psalmody. He said, in submitting the report, that had time been less restricted, he might have commented upon some objections that had been made at last Assembly and since in regard to the musical labours of the committee during the former year, but he would dismiss these with the general remark, that, in fitting time and place, he was ready, in the terms of ancient chivalry, to defend these "against all deadly." He would notice one, however, which affected the proposal of new versions, viz., that these would bring in a number of difficult tunes, which their people could not acquire. He affirmed that there was no necessary connexion between difficult music and any form of metre. There were plenty of difficulty tunes in common metre, and plenty of easy ones in peculiar metres. Four of the tunes referred to were printed in last year's report, so that all might judge of their fitness for popular acquisition. The most elaborate metre they offered is that for the tune "Ein feste burg," which rings throughout all Germany in schools, churches, &c., and he saw no reason why it should not be so in Scotland. With regard to funds, he thought it was very unfortunate that they had not a supply at their disposal, more especially with reference to the department of the teaching of sacred music by persons well qualified for the duty. In many localities ministers and others admitted that they were anxious for the improvement of the psalmody in their congregations,

but they stated, as the great drawback, that they had not in the locality any person that was qualified to undertake the task of musical teaching. In this way the mouth of the committee was in a great measure shut, and the movement for the improvement of psalmody in these districts was brought to a stand-still. The United Presbyterian Church had repeatedly given their committee a considerable grant for such purposes. With regard to chanting, he said that it was a kind of music which had been gaining ground in past years in various denominations, and, among others, the English Presbyterian Church had formally adopted it. It was also finding its way into the Free Church. That had not arisen from any movement on the part of the committee; they had been almost silent on the subject. They had acted throughout with very great caution; and though they had nothing to say against that kind of music, they did not like to do anything to favour the introduction of it till the proper time. That time, he thought, had now come, and it was desirable that it should now be looked at by the Assembly, though, perhaps, it was scarcely necessary that they should pronounce any formal deliverance on the subject. The great point involved in this matter, which he hoped would receive the attentive consideration of the House, was the necessity of considering the question of using larger portions of the Psalms than they had been accustomed to do in past years. He believed that there was a strong feeling getting up on that subject in many quarters. They had been accustomed to cut up the Psalms, as it were, into shreds and patches, by making short selections from them; but it was rarely the case that they got through a Psalm in such a way as to preserve the connexion between one part and another. Something should be done to remedy this, and he saw nothing for it except to introduce the use of that kind of tunes. The singing of the common tunes more quickly might do something in that direction, but would not meet the real requirements of the case. After all, they would only be coming nearer to the practice of the Reformation times, for in those days four or five double verses were the average amount of a psalm that was sung at once, instead of about half that quantity, which had been the standard since ever he recollected. In relation to a statement with respect to the late Mr Hately—which had been made in the public papers—he begged to say that the committee had never delegated to him or to any other individual the selection of the *melodies* which appeared in the supplement which had been issued, or in any portion of the Scottish Psalmody; the committee, on the contrary, had always kept that in their own hands. They had consulted many who were qualified to judge in the matter, but had always decided for themselves. At the same time, so far as the harmonising was concerned, they had often consulted Mr Hately, and adopted his arrangements or alterations. With regard to the success of the recent supplement, while he would not speak definitely on the subject, he could say that those apprehensions expressed last year were not in the least likely to be realised. On the contrary, there were the most favourable reports as to the reception the book had met with. The committee did not wish congregations to rush upon these tunes and adopt them at once, to the exclusion of older ones. If they saw them making their way steadily and gradually, that was all they desired. One great, practical end that was to be served by the increased circulation of Church music throughout the country was the

supply of precentors. They were getting into difficulty in regard to these officials, for the supply was not equal to the demand. The salaries were therefore rising as high as £40 and £50; and while that was not too much, in one sense, for a highly-qualified precentor, yet when they compared the sum that was paid to a minister, who devoted all his time and energy to his work, with what was given to some precentors, who devoted only a portion of their time to their duties, they thought that matters did not stand in a due proportion. For that reason, they ought to do all in their power to increase the supply of precentors; and if proper means were used, he did not doubt that the number might be doubled within the next two or three years. There were many of them at present not by any means well qualified for the task they had undertaken; and that, again, showed the necessity for their abilities being properly tested, as suggested in the report. Turning next to the subject of new duplicate versions of psalms, Mr L. observed, that changes had twice been made in the history of the Church in regard to the psalm translations employed to the extent of an entire substitution of one set for another; and now, after two hundred years had elapsed since the last of these, it is no way surprising that a few additions should be proposed. At the last Assembly, a good deal was said by Professor Gibson and others in praise of the present version of the Psalms. He (Mr Livingston) was not disposed to disparage the present version unduly; but though that version were a great deal more perfect than it is in a literary point of view, there was one thing which they must admit, and which they could not get over, and that was, that it was almost all thrown into one form of metre. He believed, in fact, that this would soon be called the Church of the one metre. (A laugh.) There was hardly a Church of any considerable dimensions to be found in the world which had not a greater variety of metres—if not in psalms, in hymns. Were we to go on in a perpetual undeviating round of eights and sixes, as if that form of metre were under some divine warrant? (Laughter.) Mr L. then adverted to a mistake made at last Assembly in regard to the opinion of Mr Holland respecting the metrical psalms now used, and quoted that critic's real opinion as given in the report of last year. He also adverted to the phrase "mere doggerel" which another speaker had applied to the specimens then submitted, and mentioned the authors of some of them as a tolerable guarantee for respectability of style at least. As to the new versions which had been proposed, he said that certain of the specimens had been criticised in a depreciatory way by some and in a very laudatory way by others; but he hoped that when the brethren next came to consider them, they would do so with calmness and deliberation, and that they would not approach them in anything like a hostile spirit. Nothing could stand against such a spirit; and if it were directed to our present psalms, they might easily be torn in pieces. In conclusion, Mr L. made some remarks upon the words, "Make His praise glorious." The term "make" shows that a duty devolves upon man in this matter. How was it to be performed? Not by mere external service, however grand and imposing. Nor yet by mere internal emotion, however ardent. The position the Free Church occupied was between the extremes of Romanism on the one hand, and Quakerism on the other. But in the matter of praise there had always been a strong sensitiveness in regard to everything that might indicate a tendency to go in the

direction of Romanism. As illustrative of this, he had heard a story of an old woman who, on seeing on the pulpit of one of their churches cards displayed intimating the tunes to be sung, seriously shook her head, and remarked that the next thing they might expect to see there would be the head of the Virgin Mary. (Laughter.) But they should remember that, on the other hand, there was the silence of Quakerism. He conceived there was greater danger in that direction than in the other. Since he remembered, there was scarcely an individual who, when spoken to on this subject, would not reply to this effect—"Oh, if our hearts are right, what does it matter as to the mode of external utterance?" And the more pious the people were, the surer were they to give forth that sentiment. This view of praise stands much nearer to Quakerism than most people seem to suppose. The latter reduces the external to nothing; the former, while retaining it in practice, makes it next to nothing in theory. If we are to make God's praise glorious, let the true position of this Church be maintained. Let the internal be ever first and highest; but let the external have its rightful place, which undoubtedly it has not had in recent times. The matter is well put by Watts:—

" With all my powers of heart and tongue,
I'll praise my Maker in my song."

The powers of the heart, if alone, do not carry us beyond the range of Quakerism. The powers of the tongue, if alone, rise no higher than formalism. Both combined may be regarded as expressive of sound Protestantism. After a few other remarks, Mr Livingston concluded by submitting the report.

Dr DAVID BROWN moved the adoption of the report, and the reappointment of the committee. He further moved, as follows:—

"1. In regard to versions of psalms, the Assembly—(1.) Renew the instruction to the committee of last year; (2.) Invite ministers and elders to examine the specimens now submitted, with a view to selection, modification, and general suggestions; (3.) Grant permission to the committee to print said specimens for sale, accompanied with tunes for metre not already provided for in the Scottish Psalmody, in order that trial may be made of them by congregational associations, and in other private forms. 2. In regard to Church music, they find—(1.) That in present circumstances it is specially requisite that all competent means be employed for extending its cultivation, in accordance with the principles recognised by the Church; (2.) That knowledge of these principles by ministers being highly conducive to this end, it is expedient that means be employed for bringing them under the consideration of students of divinity; (3.) That the committee be authorised to make trial of their proposals to test and certify the musical attainments of preceptors; (4.) That the proposal in the committee's report of last year, to appoint a special agent for directing and promoting the cultivation of Church music, is recommended to the favourable consideration of the Church."

In submitting the motion, the rev. doctor argued that in the present version of the Psalms there was too much of what might be called dead uniformity, and he advocated, as a remedy, the changes that were indicated in the report of the committee.

Dr CANDLISH objected out-and-out to the proposal in the motion for

printing the specimens for sale. These specimens might be published by private friends; and to that he would not object.

Mr ROSE, of Minard, as one of those who was opposed to the introduction of hymns, cordially approved of having versions of the psalms, provided certain elements were attended to. First of all, the versions were to be a rendering of the original, and not paraphrases in another form; secondly, the metres in which they were cast should be of such a nature as to make the psalmody suitable to the music and the worship, and not such as to require a light kind of music; and thirdly, he did not wish such a complicated version of the psalms as to require elaborate music, fitted to divert the attention of the congregation from the purpose of praise. He also approved of the suggestion of Dr Candlish.

Mr WALTER WOOD objected to anything being laid down involving the principle that it was unlawful to sing anything in public worship but psalms. If that principle was laid down, then he contended that they ought to sing those psalms which were the nearest possible approach to the original, viz.—the prose version; for they had no right to make any paraphrastic version where they laid down such a principle. It was impossible to combine these things, viz.—an attempt to have a strictly accurate translation which went no further than the original, and at the same time to frame the words which should be suitable for singing.

Mr THOMSON, of St Stephen's, said that the principle upon which the committee proceeded was to get a selection of versions as close as possible to the original; and Mr Rose would find that the new versions were quite as literal as those in present use, indeed more so. As to the tunes to be used, that was a different matter. He trusted that the Assembly would never find it necessary to sit in judgment on the kind of tunes which should be sung in worship-music. If they improved the taste of their people, and were to have a revival of religion in the Church, he was sure that they would have a style of singing in accordance with the psalms themselves.

Dr M. MITCHELL said he could not allow the discussion to close without one brief but strong expression of his conviction of the valuable services which the psalmody committee has rendered to the Church in supplying the new versions of psalms which the report embodied. Perhaps there was no literary work that demanded greater delicacy of touch, or more consummate skill, than the rendering of the psalms into modern English verse. Many men of high culture, and of genuine poetic power, had failed in the attempt. Considering this, he deemed the specimens embodied in the report deserving of much commendation. He was not prepared to accept of the whole of them; but, undoubtedly, a good many would stand the test of criticism. He trusted the committee would be able to hold on as they had begun. He would further venture to suggest that perhaps it might be well to supply a good many versions in the long and short metres already familiar to our people. More intricate measures were also needed; yet, if difficult to the common people, would prove, however beautiful, less useful. On the whole, he thought the psalmody committee had done most valuable work, as shown in each section of the report.

Dr DOUGLAS, (M.D.,) would not detain the Assembly by speaking of

other parts of the report, but wished to remind members of what is said of the desire of the committee to carry out an effective system of teaching a pure and simple psalmody in the congregations of the Church. It was the opinion of the late Mr Hately that such a scheme should prove self-supporting, though not in the first instance; and during last year something had been attempted in this direction. Teachers of character and ability had been engaged in Edinburgh and elsewhere, and Dr Douglas urged the importance of ministers and congregations communicating with the convener in order to procure the services of qualified teachers, especially for country districts, where itinerant teachers of an inferior class, and of doubtful character, often did more harm than good. Dr Douglas begged to remind the Assembly that in this important work of teaching, and in other departments of the committee's work, it had been impossible to render effective aid to the Church for want of funds. Dr Douglas would not take upon him to say whence funds might be procured; but he must say that the annual approval of the committee's efforts expressed by the General Assembly became of little value so long as no steps were taken to put funds into the hands of the committee. It was right the House should be made aware that the whole fund at the disposal of the committee last year was £20; and that was the balance of payments by the public for admission to the "Demonstration of Psalmody" given during the Assembly of 1866. Out of this small sum the committee had to pay £8 for printing this report. Dr Douglas urged that this was not a fair position for the committee, and wished to know whether any steps could be taken, with the view of placing a small sum of money in the hands of the psalmody committee.

Mr BRUCE of Cardross and Dr CANDLISH concurred with Dr HALLIDAY DOUGLAS as to the importance of funds being obtained; and the latter suggested that the matter should be referred to the Assembly's arrangement committee, which was agreed to; and the motion was adopted, leaving out the words "for sale."

PARAPHRASES AND HYMNS.

Dr BUCHANAN gave in the report on this subject. He stated that the committee had been divided into three departments; the one to inquire as to the rule and practice of the Reformed Church of Scotland as regards the employment in public worship of paraphrases and hymns; the second to inquire as to the rule and practice of the Primitive Church on the same subject; and the third to consider the present collection of paraphrases and hymns, with a view, in the event of its being resolved that a revision of that collection should be made, to recommend what portion of them should be excluded. The several committees had reported progress; but the committee did not find themselves in a position to come to any final report on any of their reports; and if they were re-appointed, they hoped that they would be in a position to bring in a full and final report to next Assembly. This was agreed to.

RIGHTS OF COLLEAGUES AND SUCCESSORS.

This subject, and the relative overtures, were then taken up. They were to the effect that the Assembly should consider the propriety of allowing a colleague and successor to have each a vote in the Presbytery,

as the tendency of it was to destroy the balance of equal representation of congregations.

Mr WILSON of Dundee, the convener of the committee appointed by last Assembly, explained how the matter had been overlooked, in consequence of which there had been no report. He stated that if the Assembly reappointed the committee, he would undertake to have a matured report for next Assembly.

It was agreed to adopt this suggestion.

REPORT OF COMMISSIONERS ON NATIONAL EDUCATION.

Sir H. W. MONCREIFF read the following report of special committee on report of the Royal Commissioners on Education :—“The committee report that there are parts of the report by the commissioners about which the committee entertain a decided and unanimous opinion ; but there are other parts of it which seem, in the committee’s view, to call for more minute examination and more full consideration than can well be given to them during the sittings of the present Assembly. In these circumstances the committee think it best that the Assembly should at present abstain from coming to any deliverance with respect to any part either of the report or of the proposed bill, but that the Assembly should appoint a committee for the express purpose of watching over the subject, and of preparing a full report upon it, which may be presented to the meeting of commission in November, unless circumstances shall render necessary its being presented at an earlier date ; and that the Assembly should instruct the committee, if any movement take place in Parliament toward founding a measure upon the recommendation of the commissioners, to request the Moderator to call a *pro re nata* meeting of commission for the purpose of considering any such movement, and taking steps thereanent, and should instruct the Moderator to call such *pro re nata* meeting if he sees cause, it being understood that the committee shall in that case have their full report ready to be laid on the table of the commission at the *pro re nata* meeting.”

Mr NIXON expressed a hope that a report would be submitted to the Commission that might cast what he would call some satisfactory light upon the subject. Unless the deliverance were such as he might think fitted to do justice to, and advance the claims of, their own scheme, he must reserve his right to withdraw from the committee.

The report was approved.

EVENING SEDERUNT.

THE HIGHLANDS AND ISLANDS.

Dr M’LAUHLAN, who was received with applause, said—I have a few comments to make on the report which is now in the hands of the Assembly, (No. IV.) It will be seen that the business of the committee has been conducted during the year in the usual manner, that the agency has been extensive and actively employed, and we may cherish the hope that fruits have not been denied us. In dealing with the affairs of such a committee, there is a danger that this last consideration may not be sufficiently adverted to. There is a tendency to look to the agency and to it alone, and to feel that if that is abundant and well regulated, the great end has been attained, and the Church may be satisfied. And yet this is but a secondary matter after all, and if nothing else be secured, we might as well

have no existence. There is a higher and holier end than that, and we have much need, in all our operations, to be enabled to realise that end as the great one to be aimed at. The Church itself, as well as its committces, is only of value in the eye of the Master in the measure in which it is the means of bringing souls to Christ. But let me call the attention of the Assembly to the state of this important agency in the Highlands. And, first of all, let me remind them of the extent and state of the field. With its geographical extent I have no doubt that the members of this House are sufficiently well acquainted, although I daresay some of the members have never thoroughly taken in the fact that the outer Hebrides, usually called the Long Island, are not far from 200 miles in length, and that the area of the Highlands exceeds that of the rest of Scotland. Over this wide region there are at this moment spread 165 sanctioned charges, in which both Gaelic and English are used in the ordinary services of the sanctuary. In addition to these there are forty-four stations supplied by probationers and catechists, so that altogether there are 209 congregations in which the Gaelic language is preached, exclusive of Gaelic charges in the Lowlands. This is a great and important agency. This is the Church, in fact, which is chiefly supplying the Highlands with the means of grace. (Hear, hear.) For, although it may be true that the number of ministers connected with the Establishment is greater, it is equally true that, in the large majority of cases, the people do not avail themselves of their services. The privilege conferred upon this Church, in connexion with this state of matters, is a great and precious one, but the responsibility is great too. It cannot be said that this Church has been indifferent to the claims of the Highlands. I do not think I am going beyond the mark when I say that, in her disestablished state, she is doing as much for them as was done by the entire National Church before the Disruption. (Applause.) In corroboration of this statement, I have only to refer to the fact that in whole counties throughout that part of the country there is not a parish without its Free Church. In some Presbyteries the Free churches are more numerous than the Established churches. Take the Presbytery of Inverness, and it will be found that there are nine parochial churches within the bounds, while there are eleven connected with the Free Church; in Lewis there is a proportion of eight to six. It was thought a great movement, some years previous to the Disruption, when the Government endowed a number of churches, usually called Parliamentary churches. Well, the cases will be found very few in which we have not churches corresponding to those Parliamentary churches then set up. Nor have we even been neglectful of the old mission stations, in almost all of which the means of grace are maintained. The Sustentation Fund has accomplished this great work; and living as we are in the midst of the work, and engaged in carrying it on, we, like a soldier in the heat of battle, are not sufficiently aware of the great things that are accomplishing. It is true that at this moment several vacancies exist in the north-western part of the Synod of Argyll. The congregations of Appin, Ballachulish, and Strontian, are without ministers, and there is no settled minister in the Island of Mull, with the exception of that portion of it which is attached to the congregation at Iona. This destitution has chiefly arisen from the translation of ministers to other localities, and while much to be regretted, is such a state of matters as may occur at any time in any section of the Church. Con-

gregations cannot be prevented from calling ministers, even from spheres where their labours are of the utmost importance, and which it is most undesirable should be left vacant. If the ministers of some of these charges have been removed, it is to fill charges of no less importance elsewhere. And if the vacant charges have not been filled up, it is neither from want of preachers to call nor from want of the means of support. All those charges are on the equal dividend platform. So that the Church has performed her duty most amply. But the congregations have not as yet seen their way to agree about ministers. One of the congregations has been vacant for several years, while the people have been differing about the choice of a minister. And here I cannot but advert to one of the great difficulties arising in connexion with the filling of Highland charges—a difficulty which, I fear, may be an increasing one. I refer to the difficulty arising from the different tastes and inclinations of the Gaelic and English-speaking portions of congregations. It is but too true that these often differ widely in their views of ministerial qualifications, and this difference often serves to prolong vacancies, and, I must add, that I fear more from this source of dissension in Highland congregations than from any other. How it is to be met is not easily said, but if my voice could be made to reach the parties interested, I would strongly counsel preachers to make themselves fully acquainted with both languages; if they be Gaelic men, to make themselves masters of English, not that they are to aim at grafting a stilted cockney accent on the Highland brogue—(laughter)—but that they should thoroughly master the tongue in its grammar and idiom; and if they be more English-speaking men, that they should master the Gaelic, for there are no men nicer in their appreciation of their own tongue well spoken than Highlanders. If this were secured, neither party would have much room for objection. But if the objections still continue, as in some cases they may, I would most earnestly urge upon parties in congregations to have some regard for the feelings of those who see and feel differently from themselves. I would press upon the Gaelic-speaking people to have every regard to the feelings and tastes of their English-speaking neighbours. These latter are often valuable members of congregations, and although their numbers may be few, are, from their peculiar position, entitled to more deference than in other circumstances their numbers would warrant. And I would urge upon English-speaking members in Highland congregations the necessity of deferring to the tastes and strong feelings of their Gaelic neighbours. They must have some regard to this. They are the majority, and essentially these are Gaelic charges, and if this spirit of self-sacrifice were a little more practised in some cases than it is, settlements might not be so difficult of accomplishment. It may be a question too whether in some cases Presbyteries might not take a more prominent part in settlements, as they are entitled to do, than has hitherto been the case—it may be in the way of preventing unsuitable settlements, or of urging on congregations to take action in the matter of securing a minister for themselves. That settlements do occasionally take place, of the unsuitableness of which Presbyteries have no doubt, cannot be questioned, although it is a delicate question how it may be prevented. But in the other case, that of unnecessary delay, it is manifest that some parties must interfere to prevent congregations being dispersed. This is obvious in those cases where the settlement of

a minister becomes a mere bone of contention between adverse factions in a parish, instead of being a question of saving souls, and thereby promoting the Divine glory. Where vacancies are protracted for years, it does become a serious question what the duty of the Church is. The question has arisen with the committee during the past year how best to meet the requirements of many of our new important stations. Of some of these there may be the hope that by and by they will receive sanction as regular charges. But there are others of them of which this hope can hardly be cherished at almost any future period. The present system of supplying with the occasional services of a probationer for a period of three months at a time is not altogether satisfactory. It has been suggested to the committee that, in some cases, ordained missionaries might be employed with somewhat more permanent appointment, instead of preachers appointed for a short period. The principle of this arrangement has already been approved in the case of St Kilda, where an ordained missionary is at this moment labouring. I am aware that there are difficulties connected with this arrangement, which it may be difficult to overcome—that the question, so long debated, regarding ordination as implying the right to rule may be raised, and that the absence of the fixity of tenure implied in induction may cause fear that irregularities might ensue. But even then the advantages to be derived may afford a sufficient inducement to face all those difficulties and to devise a method for obviating them, in as far as it can be done. At the same time, I am far from saying that our stations have not flourished under the present system. The number of them that have passed into the category of sanctioned charges is proof to the contrary, and shows that many of our preachers have laboured most faithfully, and that their labours have been attended with a large measure of success. And they have so laboured in difficult circumstances, and without the inducements which many have had of opening up for themselves a way to a permanent settlement. The committee will be glad if the Assembly remit to them, for further consideration, this question of ordained missionaries. It is known to the Assembly that several ministers in the Highlands are on what is usually called the Church Extension Scheme, and that their income amounts to the sum contributed by their congregations, and nothing more. Even were that sum regularly paid, the provision would be altogether inadequate, but even this cannot be regularly counted upon, and these brethren had the prospect of a miserable maintenance before them. Some of these have, by the recent legislation of the Church, been admitted to the benefit of the equal dividend, but there are several still upon the original scheme. For the last two years several gentlemen have most generously contributed a fund which raised the stipends of these ministers to the level of the equal dividend of 1865; and I am most thankful to be able to say that a similar movement has been made this year, and with the prospect of similar success. (Applause.) Who knows but that the movement may continue until all these charges are received upon the general platform of the Sustentation Scheme. I cannot but do here what I have done in the report—mention the names of William M'Kinnon, Esq., of Glasgow, and George Martin, Esq., of Glasgow, who have been the liberal benefactors of the scheme, while associated with them have been H. M. Matheson, Esq., of London, Alexander Turner, Esq., of Grange, and many other well-known friends of the cause of Christ

in connexion with this Church. (Applause.) I am sure that they could not expend their means in a better cause. They have cheered the fire-sides of many worthy men, and I do pray that they may obtain a blessing for their own souls in doing so. The sum still required this year is £150. I have usually made reference in my statement as well as in my report to the labours of the ladies' associations in connexion with the education of the young, and the training of students for the ministry throughout the Highlands. (Applause.) Their work, so admirable and so praiseworthy, is carried on with the usual energy and success. This year there are sixty-four male schools maintained by the association at Edinburgh, and seven by that at Glasgow, while between them they have in effective operation thirty industrial schools taught by females. The number of pupils instructed must be somewhat above four thousand. (Hear.) All the male schools are taught by students, many of whom have been trained in the schools they teach; and to show that these students are of a good class, it is enough to refer to the honour lists of both Edinburgh and Glasgow, where the names of several of these young men will be found occupying highly creditable places; and I own to you I was gratified by finding that a ladies' teacher carried away the Clark Scholarship in the Free Church Divinity Hall of Glasgow. (Cheers.) I allow, of course, that it is not possible to find all the men of equal mark, and that much land is left still unpossessed throughout the wide desolations of the Highlands; but give us the money, and I will promise you that we shall occupy them all. The sum expended by the ladies this year amounted to about £2000. (Applause.) The example afforded by us in the matter of educating Gaelic students seems to have been adopted by our neighbours in the Establishment, and it is somewhat encouraging to us to find that the scheme is recommended in the address of her Majesty's Commissioner to the General Assembly—her Majesty suggesting, at the same time, that a portion of the gift by the crown should be devoted to this object. It will, I have no doubt, encourage our ladies to find that the first lady in the land indicates her interest in a work such as they have been engaged in, although in connexion with a different body. (Cheers.) On the subject of sites I have nothing to report, but that the people of Shieldag are still without a suitable site for a church. The site committee have had something to say on this and other cases. But I wish to say on the subject of ecclesiastical buildings how important it is that some scheme be adopted for securing the proper maintenance of these throughout the Highlands. Many of these are getting into disrepair. The people are poor and sometimes apathetic—have never, in fact, been brought fairly to feel that it belongs to them to look after them; and the consequence is, that much good money is in danger of being lost. I cannot see anything of a practical kind that would be of more benefit to this Church than the introduction of a good working scheme for the maintenance and reconstruction of our ecclesiastical buildings. (Hear, hear.) I regret to have to report that our endowment fund has made little progress during the year. It was suggested, at a conference of the Highland brethren held here last week, that an effort should be made to promote this fund by visits and addresses in some of our large cities. I am very willing to undertake this if I see any prospect of success. It should be borne in mind that the proceeds of these endowments go to the Sustentation

Fund. I must, in closing, refer to our financial condition. We have, with great difficulty, secured a balance on the right side of our account. This has been with a great struggle; but we can still say we have no debt. But I must say that these pecuniary difficulties are very harassing to me and to the committee, and I am anxious as to whether anything can be devised to relieve us of them. I would be prepared to propose an annual collection for this important scheme, were it not that this is the year of our biennial collection. I must, however, give expression to the idea that an annual collection is essential to us, if no other way of raising funds can be devised; and surely, if for other objects of less consequence an annual collection can be obtained, our countrymen in the Highlands, who have stood so firmly and faithfully by us, are entitled to every favourable consideration. Here we have a branch of our great Home Mission—the most important of all our missions, however great the importance of others may be—and surely it is not to be allowed to languish for want either of the bounty or the prayers of our people. God has been pleased to own largely His own work among the people of the Highlands. He has been pleased to raise up among them ministers and members of His Church of distinguished piety and devotedness. Among the glens and islands of that portion of our beloved land, from whence a Duff and a M'Donald sprang to fill up the list of your faithful and honoured missionaries, there are many hidden ones still who adorn the doctrine of God by lives and conversations becoming the gospel. I have learned recently of an island congregation where, at this moment, a remarkable work of grace is progressing; and if God has in times past, and is pleased now, to visit in His grace our Highlands and Islands, surely it is the place of His Church to be a fellow-worker with Him in His great and glorious work. (Much applause.)

Dr RAINY moved the adoption of the report. He said—I have always taken a very sincere interest in the prosperity and progress of this work. For many reasons it has always appeared to me to possess a special interest, and I have had a special gladness in knowing that it seemed to flourish and go forward. (Applause.) The circumstances under which the work has to be done, with which this committee concerns itself, present very considerable difficulties of a special kind, and which require special aptitude and gifts to overcome. As Dr M'Lauchlan has already remarked, it is a work which has to be carried on in two different languages. Now, many of us are very conscious that if we had to carry on our work in two languages, we should have very considerable difficulty in getting through with it; and not only so, but in many parishes the population are drawn from two distinct and separate sources, each with its own traditions, its own habits, its own ways of conceiving things, and its own ways of dealing with them. Then this population is subject to various disadvantages of a social and educational character. A large proportion of our Highland population exists in such circumstances that, with a view to any outlet or any progress in life, so that the vigour that is in the people may be developed, they must acquire and make their way by means of a language different from their mother tongue. I think that is not sufficiently considered. Consider what would be the state of our lowland population if our vigorous young men could get on only by learning to speak French. I think if we considered

that, we would feel more distinctly than we do the disadvantage under which the population of the Highlands labours. Well, then, it ought not to be forgotten with regard to this population, that we as a Church have, throughout the whole of that country—within the range of it—access to them as no other Church has. Undoubtedly we have that. (Applause.) These districts are not all in the same circumstances; you cannot ascribe to them all precisely the same religious character; they have not all had the same religious training. There are portions of the Highlands in which you will find that owing, perhaps, to the exertions of ancient families, which, long ago, came under evangelical influence, the people learned, more or less, to value the gospel, and where the influence of the pure gospel was preached, maintained, and propagated by men of very remarkable character, and whose names are held in loving remembrance as having been the means of blessing to large districts of the country. Then, there are other parts of the Highlands that were not so favoured; portions in which the presence of the pure gospel was rare; where there is a conspicuous want of that which was so conspicuously present in other portions. Into these, too, since the Disruption we have been free to go. This Free Church has free access to the people generally, and the people are prepared to receive with confidence the gospel at our hands. That being so, it lays upon us a great responsibility, which becomes all the more serious when we consider the circumstances in which, in common with other portions of our country, the Highlands are coming to be placed. Many places, no doubt, are fenced in by natural ramparts that will secure to them for long their character of seclusion, and in these the existing state of things may continue for a long while, and where hereditary feelings and usages may continue to be propagated; and this matter too will be taken advantage of by wise pastors and a wisely superintending Church. But we must remember that that is not so with respect to a large proportion of the Highland population. Railways even are now making their way into a great portion of the Highlands; and there must follow a large change, in some respects, where such is the case, through the influx of the mixed population. Rude collisions may be expected between that which exists and that which is coming to be, just as we have seen it elsewhere. One might speak of the importance to a people in their condition of being furnished in time with measures of enlightenment, such as a good education, which Government ought to supply to enable them to meet with advantage the many difficulties and disadvantages which the approaching change must cause; but confining ourselves to our own work, a great deal must depend upon the measure in which in these circumstances our Church is enabled to supply Christian guides, by providing for the services of the ordinary pastorate in the districts under the charge of this committee. In so far as we discharge our duty in this way shall we provide them with safeguards that may be the means of protection in prospect of this social change. We must feel how we are called to sympathise in the difficulties of this work, and if we duly consider the circumstances of the case, we shall find it unavoidable to take a deep interest in the progress of a committee labouring in a field which, but for the committee, would be left to a large extent destitute. I must therefore express my hope and confidence that Dr M'Lauchlan's committee will find that they will be supplied with the necessary means to enable them vigorously and pro-

gressively to carry on their work. (Hear, hear.) I do not feel any apprehension indeed on this subject. I do feel great confidence, as if, after a certain pause, we were going to move forward again as a Church freely to do what it is laid upon us and is our privilege to do. (Hear, hear.) There is no want of means, and if we are able to satisfy judicious Christian men that the means put at our command will be wisely expended in the work that in God's providence is to be done, we shall find them ready to respond to our call. And, in the second place, if we tell our people plainly and frankly that there is an obligation lying upon them—that there is alike a privilege and a duty before them in this matter—they will pour their gifts into the Lord's treasury more than they have ever done yet. (Hear.) I do feel that there is a special call in connexion with our richer members, those to whom God has given a good portion of this world's goods. I do trust that God will enrich them and other members of our Church with more grace, and will exercise their hearts to take a deeper interest in our work. There was one part of Dr M'Lauchlan's remarks in which I have a special interest as a professor—the provision of the living agency for the Highlands. I believe that some of the very best ministers the Church ever had were men who, if Providence had not opened up their way, would not have been able to have overcome the difficulties that obstructed their progress towards the Christian ministry. But that Church is not in a right state, and not like to get the best men of any class, in which there does not exist such a tone of feeling as that the best men of all classes consider it the greatest honour to which they can aspire to be ministers of Christ. (Applause.) We must not presume that without making the necessary sacrifices for that object we are to count on having a ministry raised up such as we must desire; but, on the other hand, we must beware of allowing the presumption to slide in, that, therefore, the ministry is to be looked on as other professions are to be looked on, and that it must be taken as a matter of course that young men who have greater pecuniary inducements before them are to consider it as a thing they may not be bound before God to do—to give themselves up to this service in the ministry. I think we are in danger of falling into that mistake, and that ministers should endeavour to raise the tone of sentiment among their people in this respect. There are some who are willing to make the sacrifice themselves who shrink from saying it to others; but that should not be so. If my voice could reach young men who have superior advantages of position and education, and also the necessary gifts, I would say to them, Whatever your prospects are, whatever brilliant dreams may float before you, although these dreams should even be realised, there is a far higher and more glorious calling, and that is to be a poor minister of Jesus Christ. (Cheers.) They may say, But we will be poor. And why not be poor? (Cheers.) Is this too much, in this age of the world, that a young man who fears God and loves Christ should not say this to himself? Ay, and perhaps the very first lesson such a man would have to learn is that, instead of doing a very gracious thing, as he might at first suppose, by giving himself up to poverty which he might have avoided—the first lesson he learns in spiritual darkness and heaviness may be to count it the greatest blessing he can gain to have God indicate to him that possibly He may be so merciful to him as to clear his call to the ministry. There is no

man, whatever his infirmities and conscious shortcomings in his work, who deserves the name of a minister, who would ever have given it up for the most brilliant success the world can give. What you have to look for, I would say, if my voice could reach them, is a work the noblest, grandest, and purest, telling directly on eternity and immortality—a work in which God will be near to you, and such that, when you come to die, you will die thanking God with all your heart that He had put you into the ministry. I think our Church should take that position, and go to the very choicest of our young men, and put it to them whether their duty is not to lead on, and show what sort of trust in God they have, and what aspirations should characterise those who profess they have been taught to love Him, and desire to follow Him as long as they are in this world. (Applause.)

Mr CAMERON, Ardersier, seconded the motion for the adoption of the report, with the following addition, of which he had given notice:—“And further, the General Assembly direct the special attention of the committee to the spiritual destitution prevailing in the following places within the bounds of the Synod of Argyle,—viz., Tyree, Mull, Morven, Ardnamurchan, Colonsay, Jura, and Lochaweside; and also to the small parish of Small Isles within the Synod of Glenelg.” He remarked that he intended this as an addition, and not by any means as an amendment upon the motion. Neither did he mean to imply by it that the committee had not been attending to their work. What he meant to show was, that at that stage of their history they must pay *special* attention to the places he had mentioned. At Dr M'Lauchlan's breakfast the other day a respected minister of the United Presbyterian Church had made this statement. He said that there was no Church in Scotland that could deal with the spiritual destitution in the Highlands but the Free Church. The Secession Church and the United Presbyterian Church, he said, were never able to grapple with the destitution, the reason being that they had no Gaelic-speaking ministers. (Hear.) Then he had to make the Assembly aware of facts which were not contradictory of the report or of the statement of the convener, but which were of great importance. Since the Disruption the parish of Morven had been without a minister; Ardnamurchan was in the same condition. The whole Island of Mull, with the exception of one minister at Tobermory, had been without a minister. Just now Tobermory was without a minister. Then they had never had a minister at Tyree, nor in the parish of Small Isles, nor in Colonsay, nor in Jura. Notwithstanding this, he was astonished that the people in those districts still cleave to the Free Church, while all the provision that had been made for them was sending them probationers and catechists to labour among them occasionally. He regretted extremely this state of things, but would not reflect upon the committee, which could only move according to the means at their disposal. He would rather appeal to the feeling of the House and ask, Is it reasonable that for twenty-four years these poor people should not have been privileged to see the face of their own pastors? It was indispensable that Ardnamurchan, Morven, and Tyree should have settled ministers, for the districts were immense. Mull could by and by have one or two ministers if the people choose to call them. He was glad to learn that assessors were to be sent by this Assembly to Tobermory, when they could see the country for themselves. He wished more ministers from

the South would accompany them, as well as some of our leading elders, if that were practicable. Besides the parishes he had mentioned, there were large parishes in the North-west Highlands which must be broken up into several parishes, for it was impossible that one minister could overtake the whole work there. They must have more funds, or they would never be able to overtake all this work. He was persuaded that an annual collection was indispensable for this purpose. They might calculate that from year to year they would come knocking at the door of the Assembly till they secured that annual collection. (Hear.) He could not help mentioning that the West Highlands was a country which differed very much from the North Highlands. The north was a valuable agricultural country, and the Free Church there was very complete. He believed the North Highlands never was as well supplied with ministers as at that moment, and he doubted very much if any country had been better supplied, on the whole, with more valuable and respectable ministers than the ministry in the North Highlands. That country was able to look out for its own interests, and must give very little trouble to the Highland Committee. But what he held was, that the Free Church must concentrate the efforts of the committee on the West Highlands. Just to illustrate what was meant, there was one district—a large district—where the Established Church had about twenty or thirty ministers, but where the Free Church at present had only two. (Hear.) If the vacancies were filled, the contrast would not be so great. He did not wish to say anything about the Established Church—he did not know anything of the character of its ministrations; but he was not prepared to tell our people to go to it now, after they had come out voluntarily from it. He held that to continue to treat these people in this way was trifling with them. They had a great claim upon the Church for support; greater than any other people. He found that the Church had missions to Rome, but to efforts put forth in that and other places their brethren in the North-west Highlands had a far greater claim—more than the Romans, than the French, and people in England and in Ireland. He had been put into a strange position by some remarks he had made the other day at the conference with the English deputies, which he felt were not understood, but what he wished to say was to warn the Assembly against granting the claim of the brethren from England for an annual collection from the Free Church, for he thought it was preposterous for any Church to ask that, while their own people were perishing for lack of knowledge. He trusted their brethren would take that explanation in good part, for he did not entertain any feeling of unkindness towards them. (Hear.) The position of the Free Church, however, was different from that of the United Presbyterian Church, for they had no Church in England. He honoured that Church, as well as the English Presbyterian Church, for what they had been doing in England, and for all the efforts they had made; and nothing would please him more than to go along with them in all their efforts, if that were practicable, but he did not see it could be done just now. The first duty of the Free Church was to look after their own people, and he thought our own people were entitled to have this done before any other people were supplied. (Hear.) One thing in the report he wished to call the convener's attention to. He found it mentioned that the committee spent £1000 annually in paying the salaries of catechists. Now,

he had the greatest respect for the catechists, and he believed they had done a good work in the Church before the Disruption and after it; and while they should, of course, keep faith with the existing catechists, when these die they should not appoint successors in every case. He catechised his own parish—(hear)—old and young alike in it, and many of his brethren were in the custom of doing the same thing. He dared say that catechising was going out of fashion in the south—(hear, hear)—but they were determined in the north never to give it up. So long as they did this, he felt certain that neither their people nor them would trouble the Assembly with heretical cases from the Highlands. (Applause.) They had no lapsed masses in the Highlands properly speaking, though destitution prevailed in many places. A respected elder had given him a startling account of a visit he had paid to a Sabbath school in the south the other evening, and the character of the scholars, and he sympathised with his Lowland brethren in their difficulties, for they knew nothing in the north of such materials as they had to deal with. This fact, he thought, enhanced the claim of the Highlands upon their support. The ministers of the Highlands were greatly indebted to Professor Rainy for his address, and to the convener of the committee. (Applause.) He was confident that they could not get a better man within the bounds of the Church, who would labour more earnestly and faithfully in the work of the committee of which he had charge, than the convener. He had great pleasure in seconding the motion. (Applause.)

Rev. KENNETH M'DONALD, of Applecross, said—No committee of our Church has done more good by the same amount of means than the Highland committee. You are aware, sir, that several congregations in the Highlands are without settled ministers since the Disruption. These congregations would have been without gospel ordinances all along were it not for the good management of this committee. The Highland committee was the means of preserving the attachment of these congregations to the Free Church, so that, in spite of great disadvantages, they stand out this very day as a proof of the soundness of our principles, and contribute their mite to the moral influence of our position. But not only that, the Free Church kept hold of her congregations, she also received additions to their number from time to time through the services of the Highland committee. Many of our friends in the south seem to lose sight of the amount of work the Church had to do in the Highlands. I am sure if one of our missionaries from the foreign field were to give such a description of some place beyond the sea, as we might give of some districts in the Highlands, that the liberality of the Church would be called forth to such an extent that the question would be, where to get the men to go, and not where to get the means to send them? Far be it from me to wish that our Church should slacken her efforts to spread the gospel abroad. But it is questionable if our attention to distant quarters will justify our conduct in neglecting home affairs. (Hear.) Though much remains to be done, yet we owe gratitude to God for what is done. There is a bright side of the cloud as well as a dark one, and we should not shut our eyes to it. I venture to say that more work is done by the Free Church in the Highlands than her more hopeful friends could have anticipated at the Disruption. Those who look at one side of the matter may devise new plans and propose new schemes for dealing with the spiritual destitution of the High-

lands, but it is quite clear that all that is required, in order to carry on the work the Church has to do there, is to support the Highland committee, and place sufficient means at their command. The success they had met with in the past is sufficient encouragement to them and to all their supporters to persevere in the work the Lord has given them to do. The idea of substituting ordained missionaries instead of probationers in order to work up the stations of the Church is out of the question. It would be introducing a foreign element into our Presbyterianism which I am quite sure would form a source of perpetual dissatisfaction and annoyance to the Church. (Hear, hear.) I was amazed at the coolness of a certain editor who expressed himself lately in reference to the state of religion in the Highlands, as if the Free Church were losing hold of her people there. His remarks were founded on some statements made by one of our ministers in a letter published in the *Daily Review*. I cannot conceive how any one with ordinary acquaintance with the history of our Church could make statements that would warrant such an inference. I endeavoured to make myself as much acquainted with the state of religion in the Highlands as many of my equals, and my experience leads me to take a different view of the matter. I am prepared to show that the position of the Church is higher—for power and influence greater—at the present moment than ever it was. I might speak of parties in power who used their influence in opposition to the Church some years ago, but who are now as favourable to our claims as they are to those of any other denomination. I might speak of moderate districts who broke off from the Established Church, and formed themselves into congregations in connexion with the Free Church. (Applause.) Some who used to sneer at our principles, and speak of Free Churchism as if it were a whim of hotheaded fanatics, now admit their mistake, and express their opinion that the Free Church, or the Free Church and some other body with which she may unite, will soon be the Church of the people of Scotland. I was about to describe the change of feeling in the north, when my attention was called to the fact that I had already spoken five minutes beyond the order of the day.

Dr McLAUCHLAN said he had no objections to the amendment of Mr Cameron, but he was not aware that the committee could do more. Though they had no ministers, they had probationers at several of the places mentioned. They had one at Morven and one at Ardnamurchan, and so far from their losing any of the people, notwithstanding the difficulties they had to deal with, they had been gaining the people. He had a letter from Ardnamurchan lately telling him that the number of the adherents of the Free Church was four hundred, a number as great as it had been at any time since the Disruption. (Applause.)

The report was unanimously agreed to.

COLONIAL AND CONTINENTAL MISSIONS.

Principal LUMSDEN gave in the report, (No. VI.) He regretted that, under unavoidable necessity, arising from the pressure of the business of this Assembly, only a very short space of time could be allotted to the consideration of this subject, so important, and of such varied interest. In these circumstances, he would restrict himself to a very short abstract, and this all the more, that there were present several brethren from

Foreign and Colonial Churches, whose addresses would be better fitted to inform and interest the House and the Church than anything which he could say. He would, first of all, refer to the state of the funds. In consequence of the progress which the Colonial Churches had made of late years, many supposed that this scheme has not now the same claims as formerly on their liberality. This was, however, a mistake; for the demand on their resources was still great and varied. It ought to be borne in mind, that whilst many of the Colonial Churches were independent of pecuniary aid, and others did much towards their own support, yet in many directions the committee required to advance assistance, and also to defray the whole expense of passage and outfit, as well as to contribute, for at least a few years, towards the stipend. In proof of this, it is to be noticed that their income, during the past year, had not been able adequately to meet the expenditure. The committee had commenced the year with a balance of £408; and, at the close of the year, there was an apparent balance of about £80; but if the Assembly considered that £100 placed to their credit was a sum which had been transmitted from a congregation in New Zealand for the outfit of a minister, it will be seen that, at the end of March last, they were in debt to the extent of about £20. A difficulty which the committee had to contend with arose from the circumstance that the ministers of other denominations received a large measure of support, in some instances their entire, from this country. This exercised a depressing influence on the Presbyterian congregations that were side by side with them, and they were apt to ascribe our less liberal aid to coldness on the part of the Free Church. He would now briefly refer to the condition of their congregations in North America. The Assembly were aware of the recent proclamation by her Majesty uniting the North American provinces under one government. This may be expected to have some influence in consolidating the Presbyterian Churches in Canada and the Lower Provinces. A union between the Presbyterian Church of the Lower Provinces and that of New Brunswick has been already effected, and it was anticipated that this would increase the strength and vigour of Presbyterianism. The committee had the greatest reason for gratification on account of the state of the Church in New Zealand. It might be said that they had almost complete possession of the land. The ministers whom the committee had been instrumental in sending out had been received with great cordiality, and had been comfortably provided for. From Otago the committee had received an urgent application for six additional ministers, and they were told that they had only to draw upon parties out there for the repayment of the money advanced for their passage and outfit. The same remark applied to other parts of New Zealand. Coming to Australia, he had to lament that in Queensland there was not only a great destitution of ministers, but also a very depressing pecuniary embarrassment, which prevented the Church there from authorising the committee to send missionaries unless the committee would send out the means of supporting them. This state of matters appealed powerfully to those in this country who had any special interest in Queensland, by reason of commercial relations, or of the fact of relatives being resident there. In South Africa there was a similar pecuniary depression; and the committee had, besides, to deplore the prevalence of that form of infidelity which was associated with the well-known name

of Bishop Colenso. Our ministers there tell us that the most lamentable results are manifest in the religion and morality of the people. Then some of the bishops in South Africa, zealous for the promotion of denominational interests, are accustomed to ordain to the ministry, and to maintain at a cheap rate, but on their own charges, young men of very inferior qualification and training. In this way, also, Episcopacy exercises a pernicious influence, both on the character of the ministry and on the religion, intelligence, and habits of the people. Professor Lumsden then reminded the House that the Colonial Committee had been appointed for promoting the religious interests of Scottish Presbyterians residing both in the British Colonies and also in foreign States. It was gratifying to notice the increased interest in the state of religion on the Continent of Europe, which had been recently awakened, both as respects the natives and our own countrymen sojourning in its various kingdoms. He could not help here referring to the attempt which had been made to prevent our countrymen from meeting in Rome during the winter season for worship. Not only this Assembly and Church, but the whole Protestantism of this land, owed a debt of gratitude to the Rev. James Lewis for the judicious promptitude and firmness which he displayed in maintaining the rights of Protestants against the Papal authorities. (Applause.) Mr Lewis had achieved a real triumph on that occasion, not only for the Free Church, but for Protestantism. Professor Lumsden then referred to the stations which they had opened at Lausanne, Lisbon, and Venice, and to the service which Dr Stewart of Leghorn and Mr M'Dougall of Florence had rendered in connexion with these services. He regretted that the latter gentleman was at present laid aside through indisposition. Mr Stewart, of Tarland, had agreed to accept a call or invitation from the residents at Lisbon to officiate as minister there. Mr S. had been labouring there for some months, and had found a wide field of usefulness. At Venice, Mr Campbell of Markinch is at present officiating with most encouraging success. After referring to other operations of the committee, in particular, to the devoted services of Mr King, in Java, which during the past year had been accompanied with marked tokens of Divine favour, Professor Lumsden concluded by commending the scheme as one singularly extensive in its range, varied in its objects, wonderfully successful in its past history, and having peculiar claims upon the Church. He then introduced the brethren from Foreign and Colonial Churches who had been deputed to wait on this Assembly.

Mr HERMANN WAAS said—Moderator, it is a comparatively slight deficiency and infirmity which is indicated by this paper staff in my hand; I do not care so very much about that, firmly trusting in your kind forbearance, especially as I at once promise to be as short as possible. And though I cannot speak like a Scotchman, yet I do feel like any Free Churchman, like any true, warm, faithful, consistent Presbyterian heart, like any Christian longing for true freedom, either in Scotland or in Holland, in France or in America, or in whatever quarter of the world. But there is another infirmity heavily weighing upon the pride of my natural heart, for I cannot rise as one that is called to join them who are building the walls of this blessed Zion, but I must appear before you and this noble Assembly as a beggar for the first time, and, would to God, for the last time in my life. (Laughter and applause.) What relieves this, my depressing feeling, is the fact that the poor distressed widow who has sent

me hither as her representative has already experienced a great loving-kindness and sympathy from several members of this Assembly, to whom I have most respectfully to express a thousand warmest thanks, for the case of the Reformed congregation at Pillau, in Eastern Prussia, has not been altogether unknown in the Free Church of Scotland these five years. On the contrary, it was the continental committee of the Free Church of Scotland that encouraged that poor widow, at that remote corner of the large city in which this Church is a strong castle and blessed stronghold of our heavenly King, to build at least a small hut and a free hearth of her own. God bless the memory of the late Dr John Bonar, then convener of the colonial and continental committee of the Free Church of Scotland! The poor widow whose business it is to buy and sell good pearls—strange contradiction! never mind! there are many more such seeming contradictions in Christian life (as “dying, and behold, we live; as chastened, and not killed; as sorrowful, yet always rejoicing; as poor, yet making many rich; as having nothing, and yet possessing all things” —“*Nec tamen consumebatur*,” and so on)—(applause)—I say that poor widow began to collect money, she starved—that is to say, she missed whatever she could, she gave up and sacrificed whatever she could. Two hundred and eighty souls—that is all; most of whom are poor; yet in the course of five years they brought together, from their own means, 3000 thalers—say, about £500 sterling. Besides, they were happy enough to be presented with about £450 from their brethren in Great Britain, Holland, and Germany. (Cheers.) At length the poor widow, pressed by her adversary, began building. But every item of the estimate costing a good deal, or rather a very bad deal, more than she had reckoned upon, she was in the alternative either to let her house stand half-finished and exposed to storms and rains, or to appeal to the further assistance of brotherly love. She hastily sent her messenger to Scotland. I am only sorry to say she was stupid enough to send one of her most unable members—namely, my poor self, last year; and I came *post festum*—that is to say, after the Assembly had done their sacred work. However, I was favoured to state the case to the continental committee, and went home with many good encouragements and blessings, and some good pounds. (Laughter and cheers.) And, recently, I am happy to read in the committee’s report that they have had the kindness to grant £20 a year for three years, to help in the support of the minister of Pillau, for which I beg to return my humble thanks—the more joyfully, as my people will henceforth have no occasion to call me an insupportable pastor. (Renewed laughter and applause.) On my arriving home, I found the exterior building almost finished; for the good elders had most firmly counted upon my bringing home large bags of money. I gave them reproaches—“How can you build on without having money?” “Why, pastor,” they replied, “you always preach we must believe and trust, only believe and trust in our Lord that we may be saved; and now you give us reproaches because we have believed and trusted only to get our lovely church finished. We have built on confidence; and if our faith could not bring us under an earthly roof, how could it bring us into the heavenly mansions?” Well, I was obliged to submit, and said—“You are quite right. Our Lord will help us.” But our Lord, according to His unsearchable wisdom, sent us the cholera, and this cruel plague left us some widows and orphans to be provided for. My dear

people did provide for the widows and orphans as well as they could, and besides brought together in the course of this last severe winter about 600 thalers to pay a small part of our most heavily pressing debts, (for our creditors are not all credentes, *i.e.*, believers.) But now, I assure you, Moderator, the poor widow is greatly exhausted; she is like a squeezed orange. And now I am here to plead for her at your bar, crying, Avenge me of my adversary! The widow's adversary, Moderator, is your adversary—with your kind permission. I am only a poor beggar here, and not a prophet. Nevertheless, I am bold enough to cry out as loud as I can. The wind blowing all over the world comes from Rome; let the Pope outwardly be in a situation never so poorly, let him lose his earthly throne, I say, the wind blowing all over the world blows from Rome, and that Channel between England and France seems not to have proved large enough to moderate that singing wind materially. Nay, sir, I am thoroughly persuaded that, if the Pope should comfort himself for his worldly losses by condescending to human feelings and taking a wife, and should allow his priests to take a legal wife, the winds blowing all over the world will blow more directly from Rome. Moderator of the General Assembly of the Free Church of Scotland, I fully believe it is your privilege from above to moderate, nay, to rebuke and abate that singing wind, and to save whatever plant of the Lord's vineyard is placed under your influence, from the pernicious attacks of that singing wind, which flatters the flesh, but grieves the Holy Spirit of God, whereby we are sealed unto the day of redemption. But, sir, I most humbly beg your pardon, just remembering that I have left the parable and my poor widow. Returning to her, I beg to ask you, would you, could you allow the adversary to torment her any longer? Is it not a sufficient trial for her that some fifty years ago they shut up her own school, and that she must send her children to a school where they are brought under the daily influence of what they call Lutheranism, where they are taught, not our precious Heidelberg Catechism, but the Lutheran Catechism, with its corruption of God's Ten Commandments, with its consubstantiation and ubiquity of the Lord's body? Education in Prussia is regulated by the State; the school is a State institution; and there is no remedy at present if the government places a school under the inspection and direction of a Lutheran clergyman, who perfumes the church, adorns his altar, exposes his images, elevates his cup, and lays his wafers upon the tongues of the communicants. Ought she not to strive to re-establish her own school? and is not the erection of her Church the indispensable premise thereof? Or would you refuse her, saying, "What have I to do with thee? Go, and call on such as are nearer to thee than I am." I beg to reply, No one in the world is nearer to her than the Free Church of Scotland, for whom she joins all living members of the Reformed Church in interceding at the throne of grace. I know very well you have to do a great work in spreading the pure and undefiled gospel in many other countries of the Continent, that many souls may be awakened to the freedom in Christ, and may see and walk in the light of life. I am sure, sir, you do not think my country to be quite an unimportant district. It is imperative—Dr Buchanan last glorious Thursday said—it is imperative at the present time for all branches of the Presbyterian Church to hold together. Should it, then, not be imperative for such a strong tree as this Church to hold and strengthen such a weak branch as the reformed

congregation in Pillau with all means in its power? The Lord will bless all the efforts you make to save souls in Holland, in France, in Italy, in almost all countries of the old and new worlds. But there is a poor widow in Eastern Prussia, too, who is struggling for freedom; and she has the light, she only wants a proper place to make it shine for the benefit of her own children and other souls, some of whom come from a distance of more than eight miles to hear the pure and undefiled gospel. Oh, thou free mother of free children, canst thou forsake her in her struggles? And mind, she not only prays for thee, but is also ready to work for thee as well as she can. Moderator, a couple of thousands of British sailors visit the harbour of Pillau every year; they have had no public worship at all till now, for there is no proper meeting place to be had in all the town, not even a large room. As often as I invited them to the largest room of my house, an insupportable heat and atmosphere disturbed our edification; and to the church in the fortress I cannot invite them, as my own congregation have admittance to that church for not more than two successive hours every Sabbath, the rest of the time being occupied by the Lutheran and garrison communities. But as soon as our church is finished, a regular Sabbath worship in the English language will be established. Need I add that the widow of Pillau will endeavour to offer your countrymen none but good pearls? I do not know, sir, if she has by this time succeeded in troubling you to some degree of satisfaction. If not, I am sure she comes again and again. Mind lest by her continual coming she weary you. Methinks you had better get rid of her by helping her at once. £300 are still required for the completion of her church; and should you wish her to be freed from the debts she has contracted, £150 more are indispensable. In which way you will avenge her I don't know. But whatever way you may choose, I submit the poor widow's cause with full confidence to that charity which never faileth. Only a single word more with your kindest allowance, Moderator. I love her Majesty your Queen, because she is the sovereign of a free people; may our Lord Jesus bless her and comfort her, until He gives her a heavenly crown! But so much do I love her that I have great difficulty in waiting for the moment when you will present me with at least three hundred copies of her image in gold. (Loud laughter and cheers.) I must not omit, however, remarking that your paper is fanciful paper, too; it does great things all over the world. In short, money! money! money! that is my last word but one. And now, Moderator, do you speak the word only, Build on! and my last word will be, Thanks! God's everlasting blessings upon the Free Church of Scotland! He that watereth is watered. (Applause.)

The Rev. M. ELIE VERNIER, of Geneva, then addressed the Assembly on behalf of the Evangelical Society of Geneva, on the ground of the pastors it had put forth and the influence which it had in general exerted in defence of Protestantism. It had done great good in France; and by means of its colporteurs 100,000 copies of the Word of God had been circulated.

Dr TURNBULL, of Valparaiso, said—I am pleased in having the opportunity of laying before this Assembly the history, in brief, of a congregation that shows what may be accomplished by your own colonial and continental committee. In 1845 the first effort of this kind in Valparaiso was made. The attendance was extremely small, sometimes not more

than ten, seldom more than twenty persons, gathered on a ship's deck. But now there are near a hundred communicants, and a congregation of four hundred persons ; a church has been built, Sabbath and week-day schools organised, and a society formed for instituting the Word of God and Christian literature in all languages. This congregation has for fifteen years been entirely self-supporting, and has even been enabled to aid in supporting gospel influences and ordinances for others in the country where we dwell. A second congregation has been formed in Santiago, the capital, and still more recently, an evangelist has been obtained to itinerate, visiting families and small communities of foreigners in the country and along the coast.

Naturally our interest has been awakened for the country in which we live, though the laws were opposed to public worship not Romish, we have never been seriously interfered with. In 1855 the congregation had so increased that our private chapel rooms becoming to strait, it was necessary to build. When the building was nearly completed, an order was issued by the authorities to suspend work upon it ; we were likewise warned officially, that by law Presbyterian worship was not allowed, and that we must be prepared for the penalties of the law, if such was the intention of the building. This had a harsh sound ; but it was simply to temporise with the clergy. I say it in honour of the government of Chili, which has always respected our religious rights, as worshippers of God, in spite of the murmurings of the priesthood, and even in disregard of the letter of the law. Neither insult from the people nor unkindness from the authorities have I ever received ; on the contrary, I take pleasure in saying that men in private life, as well as some in power, have shown me attentions and rendered most valuable aid whenever I have had occasion to ask it.

Indeed, discussions of the gravest points of religious truth have, from time to time, been raised and conducted in the daily press of Chili, to which the people have accorded their attention and sympathy. Of Romish errors I have spoken as brief in Valparaiso as I could have done here ; and while the laws of the country forbade attacking Romish dogmas, I have been allowed to do it with perfect impunity, the clergy well knowing that a prosecution would redound more to the injury of their cause than of ours.

The difficulty in the Spanish American countries is, not that the people are unmindful of liberty, not that they are unkind to foreigners, nor that they are not patriotic, but that they have not the gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ, as He published it. Their clergy gave them not the truth as the self-sacrificing Saviour gave it to the world. This gospel is needed for their emancipation from the bonds that detains them now. We desire to give them the open Bible, to set before them the free knowledge of the Redeemer who was crucified. As Romanism has kept Spain back, so has that erroneous form of religion which Spain imparted, instead of Christian truth, to her colonies hindered the progress of the Spanish American Republics ; and now we must offer them the words of Christ himself.

What I have to ask of you, Christian brethren of Scotland, is,

First, You aid us to find one who, as co-pastor, may assist in preaching the gospel in English to our own people residing in Valparaiso, in the congregation of which already I have spoken ; and, second, that you

take up a line of effort for the evangelisation of some portion of the twenty millions of persons speaking the Spanish language on that continent, from Mexico to the most southern part of our Chilian coast. You may win the laurel of glorious and encouraging success. In Rio Janeiro not less than three distinct congregations have been gathered within eight years, comprising more than a hundred Portugese communicants, a measure of success almost unprecedented in the history of missions anywhere else.

Would that your own free and efficient Church might be encouraged to go and labour their.

Dr VAN NESS, a deputy from the Dutch Reformed Church of North America, next addressed the Assembly. He said that their Church, being of continental origin, retained some liturgical forms, especially in the administration of the sacraments. They had a liturgy, but it was a singular fact that, being originally a liturgical Church, they seemed to be gradually throwing off the bonds—(applause)—and except the forms for the ordination of office-bearers, few of the rest were observed. They paid great attention to doctrine; there was a rule that, in the course of four years, a certain series of doctrine should be preached, and every minister was called to account whether he had preached these doctrines faithfully. The number of their churches was 440, while the number of their ministers was 447. This was a remarkable fact in an American Church, that they had more ministers than churches, and showed a degree of prosperity. He referred to the union between the American Churches, and expressed the great delight he would feel to see a union between the Old School Presbyterians, the New School Presbyterians, the Cumberland Presbyterians, the United Presbyterians, the Reformed Presbyterians, the Reformed Dutch Church, and the German Reformed Church—all Presbyterians—making an aggregate of 8000 churches.

Rev. Dr HAMILTON, who was introduced by Principal Lumsden of Aberdeen, next addressed the Assembly, and gave a brief but interesting account of the progress of missionary work under the auspices of the French Canadian Society in America. The address was similar to that which we recently reported as having been delivered in the Synod of the United Presbyterian Church.

Rev. JAMES CAMERON next addressed the House as a deputy from the Presbyterian Church of New South Wales. He conveyed the fraternal salutations of that body towards the Free Church of Scotland, and said that whatever the people of the Church in Australia are in name, they are in heart, at least, no less Free Church than they ever were. (Applause.) With respect to all that concerned the Church's spiritual independence, the Presbyterian Church in New South Wales was just as free as the Free Church herself. (Applause.) With reference to the position and prospects of the Church with which he was connected, he said that the whole history of Presbyterianism in the colony had been very far from a satisfactory one; it had till recently been a sad record of unseemly and disastrous strifes and contentions, but these strifes and divisions had now come to an end, and the union of the Presbyterian Churches, which had been so long looked for and so fervently prayed for, had been reached at last. (Applause.) In September last their negotiations were brought to a happy issue, and their first General Assembly was then held, consisting of 72 members—44 ministers and 28 elders. The

greatest harmony pervaded the Assembly, and they had felt it to be a happy and refreshing time; they had been able to prove the truth of the old saying, that "union is strength." (Applause.) They had now a firm and compact Church, resting on a sound and scriptural basis—the Presbyterian Church of New South Wales. (Applause.) The second Assembly was as cordial, happy, and harmonious as the first; and its proceedings were enlivened by a distinguished minister of this Church, whose name had already been mentioned—the Rev. Mr Dykes—(applause)—who expressed himself very much gratified with all that he saw and heard in that Assembly, and complimented them on the order and dignity of their proceedings. He (Mr Cameron) had received numerous testimonies from the brethren there as to the profound impression produced on the ministers and people by the profound address which Mr Dykes delivered. Mr Cameron concluded by cordially acknowledging the sympathy, kindness, and aid which the Church with which he is connected had, and he hoped would long experience, at the hands of the Free Church of Scotland. (Applause.)

Rev. P. BARCLAY next addressed the Assembly, and gave a brief account of the work of the ministry in which he is engaged in New Zealand. He expressed a hope that the contemplated union among the Presbyterian Churches in Scotland might soon be realised—if it were for no other reason than that it might save the strength of the Churches at home, so that they might be able to spare more labourers to overtake the work in the colonies. He noticed that many of the ministers of the Church went abroad for the sake of their health—they went, for instance, to explore the Holy Land, and he could only hope that some of the ministers of the Free Church would come over to New Zealand, which would cost them little more expense, and would make that land holy in the highest sense. If Dr Buchanan, for instance, would take a furlough, and come over to New Zealand, he might be able to write such a book as would do the colony a world of good, and tend to bring many fresh labourers to the field. (Applause.)

Rev. A. N. SOMERVILLE, Glasgow—At this very late hour, I rise under a feeling of great oppression, to move the adoption of the report of the colonial and continental committee, and to propose certain resolutions. I have much pleasure in the advocacy of this scheme; indeed, had it been put to me to choose the missionary scheme, whose claims I would prefer to urge on the attention of this Assembly, I believe I would have selected the colonial and continental one; and this, from the high estimate of its importance which I have formed, and because there appears to be a tendency in some cases to overlook its claims. I hope the Assembly will indulge me in the utterance of a few sentences. There are three distinct departments of work of which this committee takes oversight. 1. The spiritual interests of our countrymen in the British Colonies. 2. The supply of ordinances to Scottish settlers and travellers on the Continent of Europe and elsewhere. And 3. Correspondence with Churches and societies witnessing for Christ on the Continent, and the communication of sympathy and aid to them. Let me advert to the first and second of these objects.

There are various reasons why it becomes us to take practical interest in the spiritual prosperity of our countrymen abroad. First, those who are the objects of this committee's care are our own people, our own

children, who have left our shores and our homes to sojourn among strangers. These persons are exposed to peculiar danger. In many cases they are too weak in numbers to be able at first to provide a supply of ordinances for themselves. It is a duty incumbent on us to look after the wanderers. The multitude of young men, every year, departing from our land in quest of a foreign home is very great. You, sir, and I, have dear members of our families living afar off in other climes. One would think that measures might be taken so to bring the duty of caring for those who have left this land of ordinances for others less favoured, as to call forth a warm pecuniary response from the parental heart in all parts of our country. And here let me remark in reply to those who entertain the idea that emigrants to distant colonies should not lean on the Church at home, but should maintain ordinances among themselves, that it is by no means intended that the mother country should continue to pay for the support of ordinances for her children all the world over. What is requisite for the most part in the case of the Church at home, is simply to set matters agoing; by and by the machinery abroad will move of itself, and the people, ere long, will do without our aid. We know that a pump, from not having been used for a time, occasionally becomes dry, and that its piston refuses to draw; now what is the expedient which common sense suggests as a remedy in the circumstances? Why, simply to pour *ab extra* as much water as a can will contain down the pump. The effect will be immediate. The pump, to use an old Scottish expression, will be *put on the fang*, and the water from the well will continue to flow as long as one chooses to ply the pump-handle. A little money wisely bestowed for a few years may be the means of permanently setting up ordinances in a locality, and may thus prove instrumental in supplying a district with the waters of blessing for generations to come.

Second, Another and equally important reason for supporting this scheme is, that the scheme may be considered to be the second edition or form of our Foreign Missions' Scheme. It would surely be unwise, while we send forth missionaries to teach the principles of Christianity to the heathen, to neglect to care for those professing Christians who have left our shores to reside among the heathen, and who have it in their power, and in so many ways to prove most effective promoters of missions. What is it which missionaries to the heathen find to be among the most painful hindrances to their success? Is it not the ungodly, the impure, the Sabbath-breaking example of Europeans, who have the reputation of being Christians, and are living under the eye of the heathen? On the other hand, what means are there more likely to promote the success of missionary enterprise than the consistent, upright, and holy lives of those who have gone from Christian Great Britain, and who are living on the spot where the professed missionary labours. For my own part, I have been led to the conclusion that we rely too much on the efforts of the few missionaries to the heathen whom we send forth from year to year from our shores, and that it is high time to announce that what we specially need, in addition to the labours of our noble missionaries, is *godly lives* on the part of our countrymen abroad, so as, on a large scale, to afford to the heathen specimens of what practical Christianity really is. In our day almost all popular literature is illustrated by engravings; what our missionaries require in illustration of their

teachings is a series of heaven-drawn pictures, such as is afforded by the holy lives, purity of example, truthfulness and propriety of utterance, and integrity of conduct on the part of British professing Christians in the vicinity of our mission stations, so that the heathen may, by ocular demonstrations, be convinced of the great differences between the results of their idolatries and of true Christianity. In short, that they may have visible illustration given to them of the nature, efficacy, and loveliness of the grace of God. We send missionaries to the heathen by fives and tens, but were people who leave our shores to live in distant lands to do their part aright, we should have a missionary agency among the heathen to be numbered by hundreds and thousands. It seems to me that till we have the professing Christians who leave those favoured lands where the gospel prevails, witnessing abroad for the truth by thousands, we are not likely to see the natives turn to the Lord.

Now, it is our colonial and continental scheme, which has for its object to foster and promote the efficiency of this best missionary agency, as I may call it. I mean that of the lives of foreign residents from this country who profess Christianity. No country on the face of the globe is probably so abundantly supplied with ordinances as Scotland. Of the twelve hundred millions that inhabit the globe, Scotland has but three millions; and yet these three millions have about three thousand ministers to take care of them, some thousands of Christian schools, a godly literature, and Bibles in every house. What are we to think of this marvellous concentration of spiritual appliances within this small country? Are all these for ourselves alone—are they not rather given to us that we should be benefactors of the world? Now, it is a remarkable fact that while no country is more distinguished for the abundance of its supply of means of grace than Scotland, there is no country whose people have a stronger tendency to go abroad and settle in other lands than our own? Scotsmen resemble Jews in this respect. It is well known that if we could send out expeditions to the North and South Poles, we should be sure to find a Scotsman seated on each! Why has this tendency to emigrate been so strongly implanted? Is it not that the people, issuing from this land of Bibles and ordinances, should go forth into all countries, and, by their testimony, their lives, and liberality, prove blessings to all the nations of the earth? Think of the multitude of Scottish sailors who visit foreign havens, the number of Scottish soldiers and officers in the army abroad, the crowds of emigrants who have gone to Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and South Africa; the engineers who swarm in the Mediterranean, along the coasts of Africa, India, China, in the West Indies, and along the shores of South America; the merchants, settlers, and servants abroad; the hosts of travellers who visit continental lands.

It is surely of vast importance that we care for the spiritual welfare of these people; so that, wherever they go, they may adorn the profession of the gospel, and so witness for Christ in the earth.

So strongly has this subject pressed on me, that I have often thought our General Assembly should indite an address to be published at home and to be sent abroad, reminding all professing Christians who go abroad of their high calling as the Lord's witnesses in the land of their sojourn. I also think that it would conduce to the high interests of the gospel were periodical deputations to be sent out to our foreign stations—for example, in India. I believe that were measures taken, the expenses of

such deputations might be defrayed without the Church at home being greatly burdened.

I would fain address the Assembly on the subject of the Continent, but the lateness of the hour precludes me from doing so.

There is only one other matter to which I shall refer, though in doing so I fear I may not have the sympathy of some in the Assembly. I cannot but express it as my conviction that the work of this great colonial and continental scheme cannot be adequately performed till a man has been set apart who shall devote his whole time and energies to promote the object. My heart thrilled to-night at the mention of the name of the late dear Dr John Bonar, who presided over this scheme so efficiently. If I mistake not, he enjoyed the able assistance of the present joint conveners, Principal Lumsden and Mr Irving of Falkirk; and yet, with all his own efforts and their aid, he found his work heavy enough to discharge. Why, not to speak of other things, letters require to be written by the legion. I must say that it appears to me that to combine the office of minister of a congregation with that of convener of the colonial and continental committee is to sanction the most flagrant of pluralities!

I beg to move the adoption of the following deliverance:—"The Assembly approve of the diligence of the committee, and record their thanks to the committee, and especially the conveners. The Assembly rejoice in the union recently effected between the Presbyterian Churches of the Lower Provinces and the Synod of New Brunswick, and trust that by the Divine blessing their labours will be effectual in promoting the spiritual interests of their countrymen in these colonies. The Assembly deeply sympathise with the brethren in Queensland in the pecuniary depression which has overtaken that colony, and in the great want both of ministers and of the means of affording them an adequate maintenance, and commend their wants to the generous consideration of the members of the Church. The Assembly rejoice in the progress of the Church in New Zealand, and instruct the Committee to use their best endeavours to comply with the numerous applications for ministers in that colony. The Assembly record their thanks to the Rev. James Lewis for his services in Rome during last winter, and express their unqualified approbation of the wisdom, and energy, and fidelity with which, in trying circumstances, he maintained the claim of Protestants to the exercise of their own worship in the Papal States. The Assembly rejoice in the increased interest manifested in the state of religion on the Continent, and approve of the efforts of the committee in opening new stations in Lausanne, Lisbon, and Venice, and commend anew to their care Genoa and the other stations in Italy, with a view both to the benefit of our own countrymen and of the natives. The Assembly are gratified with the success which has attended the labours of Mr Clark in Odessa, and direct the committee to watch over other similar openings, especially in the principal seaports of the Continent. The Assembly instruct the committee to direct their attention to the spiritual wants of Presbyterians resident in Valparaiso, and other cities of South America, and to consider how far an opening may be found for missionary effort among the Roman Catholic inhabitants of that Continent. Finally, the Assembly desire the Moderator to express to the brethren who are present from the colonies and foreign countries, the gratification with which

their addresses have been listened to, and the earnestness with which the Assembly desire that the blessing of God may widely rest on them and the operations in which they are engaged."

The MODERATOR then addressed the deputies as follows—Beloved brethren, from lands near and lands that are afar off upon the sea, you present to my mind a living illustration of the unity of Christ's body, the Church. Though hitherto personally strangers to one another and to us, yet united by the inward spiritual bonds which connect the members of the body of Christ, these, as by some secret attractive influence, have drawn you together here; and all the brethren greet you as children of the same family with themselves, animated by the same spirit, and partakers of a common hope. When Jesus was told of certain Greeks that had come up to worship at the feast, the circumstance immediately suggested to Him the thought of the vast harvest of souls which He was to gather from the Gentile world, and He exclaimed, "Except a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abideth alone; but if it die, it bringeth forth much fruit." In like manner, your welcome appearance in the midst of us from such divers quarters of the globe naturally leads us to think of the time when all the nations that dwell upon the face of the whole earth shall form one family, not only as they are made of one blood, but as united together in the bonds of faith and love. It is our hearts' desire and prayer that you, and the congregations and Churches with which you are connected, may be honoured to hasten on this promised consummation—even the full manifestation of the glory of Christ. May you be a spiritual leaven in the lands in which you are planted, leavening the whole lump. May you long continue to be faithful witnesses for Christ, holding forth the word of life, and displaying a banner because of the truth. And in the case of those of you who are placed in countries overrun with Popery, and infidelity, and other forms of error, and are, in consequence, exposed to formidable difficulties, we commend you to the blessing and protection of Him who, when He sent forth the twelve, said unto them, "Behold, I send you forth as sheep in the midst of wolves; be ye therefore wise as serpents, and harmless as doves." I am sure the Assembly will bear with me, and that the other deputies will not account it anything invidious, when I say that it affords me peculiar satisfaction to have the honour of occupying this chair on the occasion of the first visit to this country and this Church of Dr Turnbull, of Valparaiso. (Applause.) He is the minister of no less than six members of my family and immediate connexions, from whom I had learned the good service he has done to the cause of religious toleration, and the rights of conscience in Chili, long before his appearance here. (Applause.) I would not have referred to a matter so personal and domestic, but for the opportunity which it gives me of assuring fathers and mothers in this hall and elsewhere, that in the event of any of their young people settling in Valparaiso, they may comfort themselves with the assurance that they will have the benefits of a faithful ministry, and will enjoy the attentions of a watchful and affectionate pastor. (Applause.) And now, dear brethren, with cordial thanks for your most interesting addresses, I commend you all to God. May He bless you and keep you, and cause even your enemies to be at peace with you. (Loud applause.)

ORDINANCES ON THE CONTINENT.

The Assembly took up the special report on the supply of ordinances on the Continent, which was given in by Mr Irving, one of the conveners. It was unanimously agreed to "That the General Assembly approve of the report, and recommend the successful efforts which have been made, particularly by Mr Thomson of Paisley, for raising subscriptions towards the object in view. They rejoice that a commencement has been made in supplying ordinances to our countrymen on the Continent by opening during this summer a station at Paris, and that arrangements are in progress for supplying other places of resort. They remit the matter to the colonial and continental committee, with instructions to prosecute their inquiries as to the most suitable places for the services of ministers of our Church either during the summer or winter months; authorise them to use means to procure additional subscriptions, and commend the object to the Christian liberality of the members of the Church, especially of those interested in the spiritual welfare of relatives and others travelling or residing in continental Europe."

DEPUTATIONS TO VISIT PRESBYTERIES.

The Assembly took up the appendix to the report of the committee on religion and morals, and the overture from the Presbytery of Forres.

Mr WINTER, Dyke, appeared in support of the overture. After a few preliminary remarks, he said that he objected to the Act of the last General Assembly, in the first place because of the manner in which it was adopted. It had been come to, he maintained, in opposition to the provisions of the Act of 1697, now called the Barrier Act, which provided that any such innovation in the practice of the Church as that to which the overture referred should be sent down to Presbyteries before being sanctioned by the Assembly. In the next place, he objected to the Act, on the ground of the nature of the Act itself. He held that it was contrary to the Church's constitution, and, taken in connexion with the powers given by last General Assembly to the deputies, it seemed to be detrimental to the interests of the Church. The rev. gentleman proceeded shortly to show the grounds which had led the Presbytery to come to these conclusions, and said, in closing, that it was solely on these grounds—and by no means with any feeling against the object which the Assembly had in view in appointing these deputies—that the Presbytery had agreed to transmit the overture.

Mr STARK, Greenock, said he did not, in this case, object to the power of the General Assembly to do what they had done last year as to the appointing of these deputies, because, according to the decision of the Court of Session in the Cardross case, the Free Church had the power to do anything it liked. (Laughter.) But, at the same time, he questioned the wisdom and sagacity of the measure. Certainly he did not question the wisdom or sagacity of the gentlemen appointed on last year's deputation, because he did not know them—(laughter)—with the exception of the Rev. Mr Mackenzie, of Edinburgh, who was a very worthy man. (Applause and laughter.) He seriously questioned, however, the wisdom of appointing deputies who were to have the power to wait upon the congregations and hear the complaints of any individual members, on the part

of the General Assembly. If there was any single discontented person in the congregation, there was no calculating the mischief which that proceeding might incur. As to the appointing of these deputies, if it were to be repeated this year, he thought that instead of choosing one north and one south country Presbytery, they should try a Presbytery in the centre of Scotland, and appoint the deputies to visit the Presbytery of Edinburgh. (Laughter.) Perhaps the brethren at headquarters would be all the better of getting a visitation, like what the people in the country had last year. He had been told that on that occasion, when the congregation was asked, according to the instructions of the Assembly, whether they had anything to say against their minister, one woman replied that she had a good deal to say against him—that he had not been preaching the gospel, and that so far as the elders were concerned, if they wanted to get them, they would require to go to the market, for they were never to be found in their districts. (Laughter.) He thought that the Assembly should beware of entering on any innovation of this kind. They were entering on a very dangerous course. It struck him forcibly that if they had sent down to the Presbyteries an overture on the union question, it would have been far more advanced than it was at present. He concluded by moving, “That before deputies be sent down to visit the Presbyteries in regard to the state of morals and religion within the bounds, the proposal to do so be embodied in an overture and transmitted to Presbyteries in terms of the Barrier Act.”

Mr BALFOUR, Holyrood, seconded the motion.

Dr. J. WOOD, as convener of the committee on religion and morals, addressed the Assembly on the appendix to the report. He referred especially to the deputation appointed by last Assembly to visit the Synod of Galloway. He testified to the heartiness with which the deputation had been received, and the influence for good which he believed would result from the visitation. He denied that any inquiries had ever been made at the congregation as to whether they had any complaints to make, and said the deputation, of which he was a member, had never allowed such an opportunity.

Mr M'GREGOR, of Paisley, moved that “The Assembly withdraw the resolution of the Assembly of 1866, and instruct Presbyteries to be diligent in the discharge of their ordinary duty of visitation of the congregations under their charge.” He said his impression had been strongly in favour of the deputation and against the local parties. He had been guilty, however, of judging on insufficient grounds, and would state his conviction, now that they were under great obligation to those who made the resistance to the deputation—a resistance which had culminated in the very manly speech of Mr Winter. (Applause.)

Mr M'CORKLE, St Ninian's, said the question was—Whether the deliverance had been constitutional and regular? He maintained that it had been *ultra vires*, and objected to proceedings being carried on which superseded the practice of the Church. He seconded Mr M'Gregor's motion.

Mr HENRY, Marnoch, regarded the deputation, not as subversive of Presbyterian order, but as aiding evangelical effort. As a minister resident in the district of Strathbogie, he could only say they hailed the deputation, and enjoyed their visit exceedingly—(hear, hear)—and if the deputation was not constitutional, it was a pity that it was not. (Hear,

hear.) He trusted that a mode of appointing deputies constitutionally would be found; and as for the deputation to the Synod of Moray, so far from superseding, the Presbytery acted thoroughly in harmony with it, and the most beneficial effects followed. (Applause.)

Mr ROMANES (elder) said the idea which seemed to have been taken up, that there was a threatening aspect in the deputation, was absurd and ludicrous. He confirmed the account given by Dr Wood, that the deputation had been received with open arms.

Mr MOFFAT, Cairnie, in reply to Mr Henry's remarks, said Mr Henry might speak for himself.

Mr HENRY—I only speak for myself.

Mr MOFFAT—Yes. I beg to intimate to the General Assembly that the party who received the deputation were not even an absolute majority of the Presbytery. The Presbytery was divided into three parties—the party who received the deputation with open arms; then there was a party consisting of three members who voted that they should not be received at all; and a small party who voted that they should be received with reservations. True, the deputies did not act upon their instructions, having learnt that it would be dangerous from their collision with the Presbytery of Forres. Still those objectionable instructions were there, and which had been read out in the hearing of the Assembly, if not confirmed by it. He was disposed to support Mr McGreggor's motion.

Mr G. F. BARBOUR (elder) said no objection was made last Assembly to the appointment of the deputation, and it was considered quite constitutional.

Dr BUCHANAN would be exceedingly grieved if, in so thin a House, a step so very important was taken as the step that would be taken in the adoption of either of the two motions. Was it to be deliberately proposed to this House that it should be found incapable of sending deputies to speak to their Presbyteries, and, in conjunction with them, their congregations, on the subject of morals and religion, without the previous consent obtained of all the Presbyteries of the Church. He could not believe that the Assembly would adopt so dangerous a resolution. It might be, however, that in the phraseology of the Act, and much more in the phraseology of the instructions there might be something that would beget suspicion and dislike, and might seem to invest the deputation with a sort of inquisitorial power; but this was not intended, and he trusted that, in continuing this most blessed movement, the Assembly would do so in a manner that would make it impossible for any one to suppose it was intended to have the character supposed to belong to it. He accordingly moved a resolution, to the effect, "That without renewing the Act anent the state of religion and deputations to districts of last year, the General Assembly hereby appoint the Presbyteries in the county of Perth to be visited during the current year; and further, appoint Mr A. N. Sommerville, and Mr Andrew Bonar, ministers at Glasgow, and Mr Duncan Macgregor, minister at Dundee, with Mr Brown Douglas, Major Ross, and Captain Mackenzie, elders, to be the deputies to visit the Presbyteries and congregations of the above-named district. And without issuing any special instructions for their guidance beyond the general directions embodied in the Act of last year, that they should confer with the Presbytery of the bounds,

and in concert with them, should visit every congregation, the Assembly commend the deputies and their work to the grace and blessing of God."

Mr M'GREGOR said Dr Buchanan's proposal removed all his difficulties as to the deputations; and he willingly withdrew his motion.

Mr BALFOUR, on behalf of Mr Stark, who had retired from the House, withdrew his motion; and the proposal of Dr Buchanan was agreed to.

THE GENERAL TRUSTEES.

Mr MELDRUM, in the absence of Mr Dunlop, laid on the table the report of the General Trustees, (No. XLI.) The annexed state was also laid on the table.

ASSEMBLY ARRANGEMENTS.

Mr WILSON gave in the report of this committee, (No. XI.) The Assembly approved generally of the report; and, with reference to the particular suggestions contained in it, 1. The Assembly postponed consideration of the proposed overture anent representation of Presbyteries. 2. The General Assembly resolved to transmit the following overture to Presbyteries, viz., "The General Assembly hereby enact and ordain, with consent of a majority of Presbyteries, with reference to Act III., 1865, 'anent the platform of the equal dividend,' that all applications from aid-receiving congregations for the appointment of colleagues and successors, which are made to the commission in March, in terms of Act VIII., Assembly 1862, shall be transmitted by the commission to the special committee on the platform, to be dealt with in the same manner in which the Act VI., 1861, enacts; that the said committee shall deal with cases of vacancy, but with the proviso that if the said committee shall form an unfavourable judgment in any such case, with respect to those matters specified in the said Act, they shall report the judgment, and the grounds of it, to the General Assembly, as well as to the Presbytery of the bounds, and shall proceed no further in the case until the General Assembly shall have pronounced a judgment." The General Assembly also converted this overture into an interim Act.

The General Assembly instruct the committee on Assembly arrangements to appoint, in the Assembly's name, a suitable deputation to the Synod of the Presbyterian Church in England at its next meeting, and to prepare a recommendation to the next General Assembly as to a deputation to the Presbyterian Church in Ireland. With reference to the provincial arrangements proposed by the committee, the Assembly instruct the committee to consider those more maturely, and to report on them to the commission next March, so that all parties interested may have an opportunity of considering them before next Assembly.

ENGLISH PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH.

The Assembly resumed consideration of the subject of conference with the representatives of the English Presbyterian Church, and resolved to adopt the following deliverance:—"The General Assembly, especially with a view to our relations with the Presbyterian Church in England, add the following names to the committee on Assembly arrangements: Mr P. Hope, Mr James Walker, Mr Walter Wood, Professor Douglas, ministers; Mr James Balfour, Mr M'Lagan, Mr D. Dickson, Mr G. F. Barbour, elders. The Assembly earnestly recommend the ministers of

this Church who may be requested to render their services in organising congregations in towns in England, to yield to such request; and further, the Assembly recommend to members and congregations to receive and welcome deputations from the Presbyterian Church in England biennially, with a view to obtain collections for the cause of Church extension in England, on the same footing as collections are now made for home missions connected with the Presbyterian Church in Ireland."

TUESDAY, JUNE 4.

SANCTIONING OF CHARGES.

Mr ADAM, of Aberdeen, gave in the report on this subject. The cases embodied in the report were taken up *seriatim*, and are as follow, together with the deliverance in each case:—

In the case of *West-Calder*, in the Presbytery of Linlithgow, the Assembly in the meantime decline the application, on the ground of the smallness of the contributions to the Sustentation Fund, which amount only to the average of £3, 10s. monthly. The Assembly express their satisfaction with the progress which has been made, and cherish the hope that by another year the station may be in a fit state for erection into a ministerial charge. The committee report that this station is in the heart of a large population, with 400 adhering to the Free Church; that the association seems to be in good working order, and that the number of adherents and communicants has doubled within the last two years. The nearest Free Church is three and a half miles distant.

In the case of *Corsock*, in the Presbytery of Dumfries, the Assembly grant the application, and sanction the station at Corsock as a ministerial charge, on the understanding that, previous to the congregation proceeding to the calling of a minister, they shall satisfy the Presbytery of Dumfries and the sustentation committee, that a sum of not less than £120 a-year is being contributed to the Sustentation Fund for his maintenance. The committee report that this station is well organised, and in a very satisfactory condition. The nearest Free Church is five and a half miles distant. The committee, however, call special attention to the fact that there is no title to the church, and that a large portion of the contributions comes from two parties.

In the case of *Barony*, in the Presbytery of Glasgow, the Assembly grant the application, and sanction the Barony Territorial Mission Station along with the office-bearers and members of the Wynd Church, who have joined it, as a ministerial charge, on the understanding that, previous to the congregation proceeding to the calling of a minister, they shall satisfy the Presbytery of Glasgow and the sustentation committee, that a sum of not less than £100 annually is being contributed to the Sustentation Fund for his support, and also with the provision that the endowment attached to the Wynd Church be retained by that congregation. The committee report that this station is situated in the midst of an immense population, and that there is every reason to believe that it will soon be a self-sustaining charge.

In the case of *Cowcaddens*, in the Presbytery of Glasgow, the General Assembly grant the application, and sanction the Territorial Mission

Station at Cowcaddens as a ministerial charge, on the understanding that, previous to the calling of a minister, they shall satisfy the Presbytery of Glasgow and the sustentation committee that a sum of not less than £100 annually is being contributed to the Sustentation Fund for his maintenance. The committee report that this station is placed in the midst of a population of 15,000; that of late satisfactory progress has been made; that while no church has yet been erected, a sufficient explanation of that circumstance has been given, and that meanwhile the congregation are comfortably accommodated.

In the case of *East Millar Street Station*, in the Presbytery of Glasgow, the Assembly in the meantime decline the application, on the ground of the small contributions to the Sustentation Fund. They find that very hopeful progress has been made, and cherish the expectation that by another year the station will be in a fit condition for receiving sanction. The committee report that, while matters otherwise are in a hopeful state, the average monthly contribution to the Sustentation Fund is only £2.

In the case of *Queen's Park Station*, in the Presbytery of Glasgow, the Assembly grant the application, and sanction the Queen's Park Station as a ministerial charge, on the understanding that, previous to the congregation proceeding to the calling of a minister, they shall satisfy the Presbytery of Glasgow and the sustentation committee that a sum not less than the amount of the equal dividend is being contributed to the Sustentation Fund for his maintenance. The committee report that this station occupies a most important position, and that there can be no reasonable doubt that very soon it will be a large aid-giving congregation.

In the case of *Sandbank*, in the Presbytery of Dunoon and Inverary, the General Assembly grant the application, and sanction the station at Sandbank as a ministerial charge, on the understanding that, previous to the congregation proceeding to the calling of a minister, they shall satisfy the Presbytery of Dunoon and Inverary, and the sustentation committee, that a sum of not less than £100 is being contributed to the Sustentation Fund annually for his support. And further, the General Assembly recommend to the Home Mission committee to give a grant to this charge, in terms of their minute of 22d January 1856. The committee in their report state that, while the resident population at Sandbank is not large, and the number of communicants in the station is only forty-six, the place is largely frequented in summer, and promises to be of growing importance.

In the case of *Culross Station*, in the Presbytery of Dunfermline, the General Assembly grant the application, and sanction the station at Culross as a ministerial charge, on the understanding that, previous to the congregation proceeding to the calling of a minister, they shall satisfy the Presbytery of Dunfermline and the sustentation committee that a sum not less than £107 annually, as proposed in the application, is being contributed to the Sustentation Fund for his support. Further, the General Assembly recommend the Home Mission committee to give a grant to this charge, in terms of their minute of the 22d January 1856. The committee find that this station has existed since the time of the Disruption; that the adherents have exhibited great steadfastness and perseverance, and that the whole circumstances of the case seem to justify the sanction craved.

Mr ADAM, at *Stawick*, in the Presbytery of Jedburgh, the Assembly grant the application, and sanction the charge, on the understanding that, previous to the congregation proceeding to the calling of a minister they shall satisfy the Presbytery of Jedburgh and the sustentation committee that a sum not less than the amount of the equal dividend is being annually contributed to the Sustentation Fund for his maintenance, and also that steps for the erection of a church shall be in progress. The committee find that this is a new charge for the town of Hawick, the population of which is about 13,000. While the affairs of the station seem to be in a satisfactory state generally, no steps appear to have been taken as yet for the erection of a church.

In the case of *Durris*, in the Presbytery of Aberdeen, the Assembly grant the application, and sanction the station at Durris as a ministerial charge, on the understanding that, previous to the congregation proceeding to the calling of a minister, they shall satisfy the Presbytery of Aberdeen and the sustentation committee that a sum of not less than £80 annually is being contributed to the Sustentation Fund for his support. Further, the General Assembly recommend the home mission committee to give a grant to this charge in terms of their minute of 22d January 1856. The committee find that, while the population of the district is limited, and the resources of the congregation are not large, the distance from other Free Churches and the spiritual condition of the people, render the erection of a charge at Durris highly expedient.

In the case of *Belmont Street Station*, in the Presbytery of Aberdeen, the Assembly grant the application, and sanction the erection of the station at Belmont Street as a ministerial charge, on the understanding that, previous to the congregation proceeding to the calling of a minister, they shall satisfy the Presbytery of Aberdeen and the sustentation committee, that a sum not less than the amount of the equal dividend is being contributed to the Sustentation Fund for his support. The committee find that this station has been very recently erected; that it has already made great progress; and that there is every reason to believe that it will at once be an aid-giving congregation.

In the case of *Altnaharrow*, in the Presbytery of Tongue, the Assembly decline the application in the meantime, on the ground of the inadequate contribution to the Sustentation Fund from the congregation, and the small number of members. The Assembly recognise the importance of the situation occupied by the station, and cherish the expectation that the liberality of the friends of the Church may so aid the congregation as to justify the early erection of it as a full ministerial charge. The committee find that the church at Altnaharrow occupies an important position; that it is at a very great distance from other Free Churches; that the people labour under serious inconvenience; and that they deserve the sympathy and support of all interested in the Highlands. In this case Mr Adam hoped that by next Assembly they might see their way to grant the application to be erected into a sanctioned charge.

In the case of *Crathie*, in the Presbytery of Kincardine-O'Neil, the committee proposed that the Assembly, with acquiescence of parties, should decline the application in the meantime, because of the inadequate provision for the support of a minister in such a position as Crathie; and should recommend this congregation to the attention of the

Mr ADAM, at a subsequent stage of the proceedings, announced that he had received £100 from a friend, who did not wish his name to be mentioned, as the commencement of an endowment for the church at Crathie. (Cheers.)

ACT ANENT COLLECTIONS.

The Assembly appointed the following collections to be made during the ensuing year in all the congregations of the Free Church :—

1. On the fifth Sabbath of June, for the Colonial Scheme.
- *2. On the third Sabbath of August, for the Evangelisation of the Masses.
- *3. On the third Sabbath of October, for the Highlands and Islands.
4. On the third Sabbath of November, for the Pre-Disruption Ministers' Fund.
5. On the third Sabbath of December, for the Conversion of the Jews.
6. On the third Sabbath of February, for the College Fund.
7. On the third Sabbath of April, for the Home Mission.

And the Assembly also appoint that a collection shall be made for Foreign Missions on the third Sabbath of July, in those congregations which have no association in aid of that scheme. Further, the Assembly appoint a special collection for this year, on account of the urgent necessities of the case, for Church and Manse Building, to be made on the third Sabbath of September.

A conversational discussion took place on the Act, in the course of which Mr WILSON, of Dundee, explained the need which there was for a special collection being made for the Church and Manse Building Fund. The suggestion was thrown out by Mr Wilson and Dr Candlish that those friends of the Church who were called upon by private parties for subscriptions, and who are often annoyed by repeated calls of this description, would do well to remit the sum which they were in the habit of contributing in this way to the Church and Manse Building committee, who would be better able to judge of the merits of individual cases.

SPECIAL CASES.

The Assembly, after some conversation, adopted the following deliverances on the cases classed under this head :—

In the case of reference by the Synod of Aberdeen in the case of *Dr Mackay* and the congregation of Rhynie, the General Assembly resolve to appoint assessors to act in this case along with the Presbytery of Alford.—In the application by the Presbytery of Edinburgh, with reference to the annual premium payable for the Widows and Orphans' Fund in the case of *Dr Hanna*, the General Assembly appoint the said premium to be paid, and deducted from the ordinary dividend applicable to the congregation of St John's, Edinburgh.—In the case of the *Petition of the Deacons' Court of St John's, Edinburgh*, the General Assembly resolve that two dividends from the Sustentation Fund shall continue to be paid during the lifetime of Dr Guthrie, it being understood that the premiums payable to the Widows and Orphans' Fund, in the case of Dr

* These two have been only biennial collections.

Hanna, shall be deducted from the dividend of the junior colleague^{at}, In the case of the application by the Presbytery of Linlithgow, in the case of *Mr James Boyd*, who has resigned the charge of Polmont, the General Assembly appoint that the premium payable in order to maintain *Mr Boyd's* connexion with the Widows and Orphans' Fund, shall continue to be paid, and shall be deducted from the dividend applicable to the congregation of Polmont.—In the case of *Mr Alexander Paterson*, who proposes to retire from the charge of Dunblane, the General Assembly appoint that, in the event of *Mr Paterson's* retirement, the sum of £47 shall be annually paid to him out of the dividend of the Sustentation Fund applicable to the congregation of Dunblane, so long as he shall be unable for active duty, the said sum being inclusive of the annual premium payable on his behalf to the Widows and Orphans' Fund.—In the case of the memorial of the congregation of *Cluny*, the General Assembly postpone any deliverance at present, but resolve to appoint a committee to confer with all parties interested therein, and to bring up a report thereon to the commission at any one of its stated meetings. And the Assembly empower the commission at any ordinary meeting, after receiving the report of the committee, to dispose of the case.—In the case of the application by the Presbytery of Chanonry, in behalf of *Mr Simon Fraser*, who proposes to resign the charge of Fortrose, the General Assembly appoint that a retiring allowance of £60 shall be paid to *Mr Fraser*, and deducted from the dividend payable from the Sustentation Fund for the congregation of Fortrose, with this provision and understanding, that said allowance shall be reduced by whatever sum above £20 per annum which may be drawn by *Mr Fraser* from the Aged and Infirm Ministers' Fund.

ENDOWMENT OF COLLEGES.

The report from the committee on this subject was made verbally by *Dr CANDLISH*, who expressed his regret that he had not been able to do much on behalf of this object during the year, for reasons that were pretty well known to many of the brethren. He was as deeply impressed as ever with a sense of the vast importance of this subject; and they had made a very satisfactory arrangement in the direction of carrying out the plan which was approved of two or three years ago. He was confident that if only they entered on the prosecution of the object with vigour, entire success would be the result. He took the liberty of asking the re-appointment of the committee; but he must have the assistance of a younger and stronger minister than himself if any good were to be done. After referring to the effective service which *Dr Duns* had rendered, *Dr Candlish* proposed that *Mr Walker*, of Carnwath, should be appointed vice-convener, with *Dr Duns* as secretary. Were this done, he believed the committee would be able to report something satisfactory to next Assembly. He had been aiming at getting sums of £1000 and £2000, but they must now extend the basis of their operations.

The suggestions of *Dr Candlish* were agreed to.

LIBRARY OF REFERENCE.

Dr CANDLISH, in the absence of *Dr Begg*, gave in the report of the committee on this subject, (No. XXVI.) The Assembly approved of

the report, and re-appointed the committee,—Mr Mackenzie, of Free Church, to be associated with Dr Begg in the convenership.

POPERY.

Professor GIBSON, on the part of Dr Begg, gave in this report, (No. XXII.) He said that Dr Begg did not feel that there was any propriety in continuing the committee on Popery, not because he did not regard it as of importance, but because of the absence of funds and the comparatively small interest taken in it, and the small support given to the committee. Dr Begg was, therefore, disposed to suggest that the committee should be discharged, or, at all events, that he should be relieved of the convenership.

Mr SOMERVILLE, of Glasgow, would be sorry if the committee were, at this time, allowed to go down. In the course of some remarks, he referred to the progress and attitude of Popery at present in Great Britain, and spoke especially in terms of commendation of the work carried on by Dr Burns Thompson in the Medical Missionary Institution in Edinburgh, where that gentleman and his assistants were brought into contact with about 4000 Roman Catholics in the course of the year. The success of Dr Thompson's efforts was certainly matter of encouragement. More good, he believed, was being done by that one institution in the way of bringing the gospel to bear on the Popish mind than was being accomplished at this moment by the whole of the Free Church ministry in Glasgow.

Dr CANDLISH was in favour of discharging the committee, and thought that the true way of acting against Popery was in the direction indicated by Mr Somerville. He moved that the committee be discharged, and that special instructions be given to Presbyteries to keep in view the extreme danger of the progress of Popery, and to adopt measures for resisting its efforts.

After some conversation, the suggestion was agreed to.

HOUSES FOR THE WORKING CLASSES.

Professor GIBSON, in giving in this report, (No. XXV.,) said he was authorised by Dr Begg to state that it was not necessary to continue this committee, on the ground that public attention was thoroughly alive on the subject. The committee was accordingly discharged.

PRE-DISRUPTION MINISTERS' FUND.

Dr JULIUS WOOD gave in the report of this committee, (No. X.)

Mr THORBURN, of Leith, moved the approval of the report and the re-appointment of the committee, which was agreed to.

PLATFORM OF THE EQUAL DIVIDEND.

The Assembly took up the report on this subject. It was moved and seconded, "That the Assembly approve of the report, except in so far as concerns the proposal to place the charges of Innellan and Marshall church, Kirkintilloch, upon the platform. And the Assembly admitted to the platform of the equal dividend the charges of Knox's Church, Perth; Strath and Strathaird; Young Street church, Glasgow; and Loanhead; and that those four charges be the only aid-receiving charges admitted to that platform by the present Assembly. Further, the

General Assembly hereby admit the charge of Invergordon to the platform, on the ground that it has been aid-giving for several years." y of

It was also moved and seconded, "That the Assembly also add the charge of Hillhead, in the Presbytery of Glasgow, to the platform, and that the whole number of aid-giving congregations added be five in place of four." After reasoning, the second motion was withdrawn, with consent of the House. Therefore the Assembly declared in terms of the first motion.

JOHN KNOX'S HOUSE, CANONGATE.

The Assembly took up the memorial from the Knox congregation anent John Knox's house. Part of the minute of the Presbytery of Edinburgh on this subject was read. It was agreed that the Assembly appoint a committee to confer with the trustees of the property of John Knox's house, and with the general trustees of the Church upon the subject of this memorial, with instructions to report to next General Assembly.

MODERATING OF CALLS.

The Assembly took up the overture XIII., from the Presbytery of Edinburgh, anent moderating in calls. The Assembly remit this overture to the committee on the Form of Process, instructing them to report upon it to next General Assembly.

COLONIAL COMMITTEE.

The Assembly took into consideration the report of the committee appointed to confer with the colonial and continental committee. The Assembly approved of the report, and re-appointed the committee, with Dr Buchanan as convener, remitting to them the whole subject for further and more deliberate consideration, and instructing them, after further conference with the colonial and continental committee, to lay a full report on the table of the commission at its meeting in November, for the information of the Church, so that the next General Assembly may be prepared to adopt some final resolution regarding it.

PASTORAL ADDRESSES.

Dr CANDLISH moved the approval of the pastoral address on prevailing errors.

Mr M'CORKLE did not object to the reference made in the pastoral address to rationalism as a prevailing form of error. But that was a heresy more adapted to the meridian of Edinburgh. In rural districts they did not know so much about it, but they were often exposed to the contagion of Morrisonianism, especially in times of revival; and he thought that the address should make some reference to that heresy.

Mr W. WILSON said that the pastoral address dealt upon the error to which Mr M'Corkle referred, though not under the name and in the precise form referred to by Mr M'Corkle.

The address was then approved.

The Assembly also approved of the pastoral address to ministers, office-bearers, and members at mission stations.

RECORDS OF DISRUPTION MINISTERS.

The Assembly then called for the report of the committee on record of Disruption ministers.

Dr CANDLISH supposed they were all aware that there was no report from this committee, in consequence of the lamented death of Dr Parker. He could not omit the opportunity of expressing the very high esteem in which Dr Parker was held by all who knew him. His removal was a great discouragement as regards the realisation of the object in view. But he thought it would be a pity if the result of Dr Parker's labours was lost. He thought they should carry on the attempt for a little longer. The first thing they had to do was to ascertain how far Dr Parker had gone with his inquiries. He would suggest that the Assembly should request Mr Cameron, Maryton, to give his services for a single year, and that they should put into his hands the materials collected by Dr Parker and also by Dr Lorimer, asking him to examine these papers and to report to next Assembly, by which time they might be enabled to find some one in circumstances to carry through the work. He moved the re-appointment of the committee, with Mr Cameron as convener, on the understanding that nothing more should be required of him than that during the year he should examine the papers and report to next Assembly. He also moved that the Assembly record their sense of the value of Dr Parker's services in this and other respects as an esteemed minister of the Church.

The motion was seconded by Mr CHARLES COWAN, and agreed to.

Dr CANDLISH stated that the depute-clerk had received a communication from Mr Macfie, of Airds, in which that gentleman suggested that Dr Guthrie should be asked to undertake this record of the pre-Disruption ministers, and promising to be at all the necessary expense. Dr Caudlish said that of course they would all be very glad if Dr Guthrie could undertake this work, but he feared they could not ask him.

DISTRIBUTION OF PROBATIONERS.

The Assembly resumed consideration of the report of the committee on the distribution of probationers. On the proposal of Mr WILSON, the Assembly approve generally of the report, and appointed,—

I. That Presbytery clerks shall send to the clerks of committee the names and addresses of all who may be licensed by them, with dates of licence, within one week thereafter. And the clerk of committee shall prepare as complete a register as possible of all the probationers of the Free Church according to date of licence; but the names of probationers who shall have been ten years licensed, and shall have preached in ten vacancies, shall be entered on a separate list for occasional supply.

II. That clerks of Presbyteries shall send intimation to the clerk of committee of every vacant congregation, including colleagueships and successors, along with the name of moderator of session and the session-clerk, or other office-bearer in the vacancy with whom correspondence may be carried on.

III. That when a vacant congregation, according to the terms of the Act of Assembly 1859, shall be prepared to elect a minister at the first meeting after the vacancy has taken place, no supply shall be given from this committee; but if not so prepared, they shall, until they have elected

a minister, receive supplies, as allocated for, at least every alternate Sabbath, the other Sabbaths being reserved for the Presbytery, or such^d the congregation may wish to hear, and that so soon as an election takes place the committee be informed so as to stop further supplies. And the same rule shall also apply to charges sanctioned which may not previously have had a minister.

IV. That the committee shall meet at least once a quarter for the purpose of seeing that the Assembly's regulations are respected by vacant congregations, and also that probationers are, as far as practicable, constantly employed, the clerk, under the supervision of the convener, being authorised to make any necessary arrangements in the interim. A quarterly list of preachers and vacancies to be published in the *Missionary Record*, and a copy sent to every Presbytery clerk, probationer, and vacant congregation.

V. That Presbyteries shall afford vacant congregations every facility for hearing such preachers as the congregation may select on alternate Sabbaths, or should they not be in the habit of giving supply on alternate Sabbaths, on such Sabbaths as they may reserve in their own hands; but that *all arrangements whatever* for hearing preachers be secured by communication with the committee, whose clerk shall endeavour, as far as possible, to meet their wishes, and that moderators of vacant congregations be enjoined to read and explain these regulations at the first congregational meeting, and in no case to depart from these provisions.

VI. That preachers be prohibited from supplying vacant congregations except by appointment of this committee. When private applications are made to preachers, that they send immediate information thereof to the clerk, that, if possible, the arrangements may be entered into without any conflict with others. That preachers also give intimation of change of address and acceptance of a call, and to acknowledge receipt of appointments by *return of post*.

The Assembly enjoined all parties mentioned in the above regulations to have respect thereanent.

The Assembly remitted the remaining proposals of the committee to their further consideration.

INADEQUATE SUPPLY OF PROBATIONERS.

Dr CANDLISH, in the absence of Dr Begg, the convener of the committee on the inadequate supply of probationers, called attention to the report of the committee, (No. XXIV.) He said that he did not agree with all that was in the report, but he thought that the subject of the length of the curriculum was one well deserving of the consideration of the Church. He was by no means inclined to the view of some, that they should take an examination fully in lieu of attendance at the University and the Theological Hall. At the same time, he thought they should look in the face the fact that the curriculum was considerably longer than was required for any other profession. In the younger days of the older ministers of this Church, the average age of entrants into the college was twelve and thirteen, when a long curriculum was a necessity. But now the case was altogether different. Mr Trotter of the Edinburgh Academy told him that in consequence of the higher character of the education at such schools as Mr Oliphant's, the pupils entered the Edinburgh Academy about a year and a half older than they used to do; and if pupils at the Aca-

enemy. I remained there six or seven years, and had to go through another curriculum of eight years, on aspiring to the ministry, it was plain that was a serious obstacle, and that in the case especially of persons in straitened circumstances, they might come to the conclusion that it would be better for them to serve the Lord in some other way. He might say that the late Dr Cunningham was clearly of opinion that if the Church kept hold of a man for six years, three in the Arts classes and three in the Hall, that was sufficient. (Hear, hear.)

Professor DOUGLAS said he would not like to see anything done to introduce students into the theological halls who were not taking their proper place in the national universities, but he thought it desirable to shorten the curriculum. The exceptional cases were sufficiently provided for by the examinations of the London University, and he would not like to see the door opened wider. He thought, with Dr Candlish, that the national universities might, with great advantage, have a three months' summer session as well as what was practically a five months' winter session. He did not think that eight months in the year was too long for a professor to teach. (Hear, hear.)

After a few further remarks from Dr R. J. Brown and Mr Thomas Chalmers, the Assembly approved generally of the report, re-appointed the committee, with Dr Rainy as convener, and remitted the report to the committee for re-consideration.

RE-APPOINTMENT OF STANDING COMMITTEES.

The Assembly then re-appointed the standing committees, with the necessary modifications.

Dr BUCHANAN, in moving the re-appointment of Sustentation Fund committee, said that on the previous day the committee had received a letter from Mr Handyside, resigning his situation as secretary to the Fund, in consequence of his serious illness and advice of his medical attendants. The committee were empowered to make an interim arrangement, in the hope that Mr Handyside's health might be restored, so as to enable him to resume his duties.

CONFERENCE WITH PRESBYTERIES.

Dr BUCHANAN then submitted the plan proposed for the visitation of Presbyteries in connexion with the new movement of the Sustentation Fund committee. The Church had been divided into seven sections, containing, on an average, ten Presbyteries in each, and the deputies were intended to visit each section, and to make arrangements with the Presbyteries, so that, as soon as possible, the resolution of the Assembly on Wednesday last might be brought before all the congregations and deacons' courts. He hoped the deputies would receive all encouragement in their work. (Hear, hear.)

On the motion of Mr WILSON, the plan was approved.

Mr NIXON hoped the deputies would also charge themselves with the duty of reminding the congregations that the Church expected of them to contribute to the Education Scheme in a certain proportion of what they gave to the Sustentation Fund.

CHARGES CONTRIBUTING AT AND UNDER £50 A YEAR TO THE SUSTENTATION FUND.

Mr WILSON read the following deliverance proposed by the Sustenta-

tion Fund committee to be adopted with reference to special report on charges contributing at and under £50 per annum :—

“The General Assembly appoint the following to act as a special commission to confer with all parties connected with those congregations contributing less than £50 a year to the Sustentation Fund, into whose condition they may judge it desirable to inquire, and with the Presbyteries within whose bounds these congregations are ; and, in concurrence with said Presbyteries, to give such advice as may seem best, and to report to the General Assembly any suggestions which may occur to them, viz.—Dr Buchanan, Dr M'Lauchlan, Sir H. W. Moncreiff, Mr Wilson—ministers ; Mr F. B. Douglas, Mr John Miller, Mr George Meldrum, Dr Hugh Miller—elders. Sir H. W. Moncreiff to be convener.

The deliverance was approved.

THE UNION COMMITTEE AND THE UNION DIVISION.

On the Assembly proceeding to the re-appointment of the union committee,

Mr BURNSIDE, Falkland, suggested that some names should be added to the committee, of persons having the same views as those who had resigned.

Dr BUCHANAN suggested that Mr Elder, Rothesay, and Colonel Young should be added to the committee.

Mr NIXON said that he deeply regretted that he could not act upon the committee. Nevertheless, he had as great a regard to the honour of the committee and the work assigned it as anybody could have. He found in the list of those who voted for Dr Begg's motion seven members who ultimately voted for the motion of Dr Candlish, and it must strike every man that they could not mean by that vote that they wished Dr Begg's motion to succeed—not even as against his, (Mr Nixon's.) It was abundantly evident that this was what was called a political trick. Such things might occur among worldly men—in the House of Commons, perhaps—but surely more simplicity and godly sincerity should mark the proceedings here ; and for the honour of the committee and the great work assigned to it, he must say he thought that course was one which he could not venture to characterise, but which he hoped would not be repeated. As he found the name of Walter Wood as one of those who actually put himself in that position, he objected to his appointment as one of the members of the union committee. (Laughter.)

Mr WOOD said he was sorry to intrude himself upon the Assembly, but he hoped they would have patience while he said a word in reply to the somewhat singular attack made upon him by Mr Nixon. He had as good a right to keep a conscience as Mr Nixon had. He voted in accordance with the dictates of his own conscience, and he would like to know what right any one had to challenge him for that in the way done by Mr Nixon. Were they not to have liberty of voting as between two motions ? The question put to the Assembly was, which of the two motions—Dr Begg's or Mr Nixon's—was to be put against Dr Candlish's, and he wondered what right any one had to presume that he should not be put on a committee on that account.

Mr NIXON said he did not presume to keep Mr Wood's conscience for him—it was the last thing he would trust himself with. (Laughter.) But he was entitled to see that this House protected its own honour and

creed. What was what he cared about. Mr Wood was bound to vote for no motion which he did not approve. If any other doctrine on this point was to prevail in this House, it was high time they were endeavouring to ascertain what standard of morals was to be their rule. He (Mr Nixon) had done his duty in seeking thus to protect the character of the General Assembly.

Sir HENRY W. MONCREIFF said that, with reference to the question what a man should do in the circumstances adverted to, he was very much inclined to agree with Mr Nixon. But he could not agree in the very strong statement Mr Nixon made about it. He thought there was room for difference of opinion, for there was no doubt the question put to the House was, not which motion do you prefer in itself, but which do you prefer to put against the first motion. (Hear, hear.) That was the question put to the House, and people were entitled to take their own course as to that.

Dr RAINY said it was right also to state, in regard to this matter, since this view was put so strongly, that he had present to his mind the question whether he should vote for Mr Nixon's motion or not, because, though he did not desire it to be ultimately carried, he would not have thought it a discreditable course, if, on the whole, it had brought out the result that might have been brought out. But he thought the best course, to avoid misunderstanding, was to vote for neither motion, though he must say he did not regard it as necessarily improper if a person who was desirous of seeing the first motion passed should not have abstained from voting when the vote was taken between the second and third motions.

Captain SHEPHERD believed the clerk had put it to the House that those who were to vote for Dr Candlish's motion should sit still.

Sir HENRY W. MONCREIFF—I did not say so. I said those who wished not to vote might sit still if they pleased.

Mr R. C. SMITH said that the question came to be which was the best way of taking the vote.

Mr SAWERS, Gargunnoch—The question now is, what is the best committee? He was exceedingly sorry that so many had withdrawn from the committee, so that he could not have the same confidence as before in their carrying the Church along with them. (A laugh.) He thought if the members who had resigned would reconsider their resolution, and go along with the committee as they best might, they would lead the Church with them. Failing that, he thought they would hardly get successors in the whole Church that would give as much confidence in the committee. If that might not be, he thought they should appoint other members who would be likely to command the confidence of the whole Church, and he would suggest the name of Mr R. C. Smith for one. He had been told by a member of Assembly that the committee would get on all the better in the absence of the members who had resigned; but that was not the way to secure the confidence of the Church.

Dr BUCHANAN said that Mr Sawers had totally mistaken the mind of the rest of the committee if he thought that they wished those members to resign. They were anxious rather that they should recall their resignation, and he had the greatest confidence that most, if not all of them, would yet see their way to return. He had pressed Mr R. C. Smith to go upon the committee, but that gentleman—from native modesty, he

believed—had declined. He would be glad if he would yet consent. (Hear, hear.)

Mr R. C. SMITH thanked Dr Buchanan and Dr Rainy for the way in which they had spoken of him, but, for reasons with which it was unnecessary to trouble the Assembly, he must decline.

The committee was then appointed.

CORRESPONDENCE WITH AMERICAN CHURCHES.

Dr CANDLISH read the detailed deliverance in regard to the reception of the American deputies. He also proposed that it be remitted to the Assembly arrangements' committee to consider whether they could suggest any plan for the interchange of deputies. Of course, they could not send annual deputations, and the committee might consider whether any plan could be arranged by which the United Presbyterian Church, the Reformed Presbyterian Church, and the Free Church could send deputies yearly in rotation.

The following is the deliverance as adopted :—"The General Assembly record the high satisfaction with which they have received the visit of their American brethren, and they cordially respond to their expressions of Christian sympathy and good will. They are fully alive to the happy results which, by the Divine blessing, must flow from such an interchange of visits, and trust that it will become a marked feature in the future proceedings of evangelical churches on both sides of the Atlantic. They believe that, in addition to this reciprocation of sentiment by letter, accredited representatives should be present from time to time at those stated ecclesiastical meetings in which the public life of the Church finds its free and full expression. More especially, the General Assembly rejoice to hear of the marked progress made by the United States since the close of the great civil war, and they hope that the reconstruction of the commonwealth may steadily proceed on the basis of those principles of justice and freedom in the strength of which the struggle was brought to a successful close. They are fully aware of the great difficulties attending this new era of American Christianity and civilisation, and they shall look with intense interest on the spectacle of a people which at enormous cost has thrown off the load of slavery, doing what it can and ought for the Christian training of those who have so recently been admitted to the rights and responsibilities of liberty. They hail it as a token for good that so much has already been done by the Freedmen's Society and other Christian agencies, and they accept this as an augury with regard to the future of the African race in the acquisition of knowledge, the discharge of the duties of citizenship, and the development of Christian character. It is their earnest hope that the negro may not only be fitted for his new sphere of duty in America, but that he may be honoured of God to act an important part in the evangelisation of Africa, from which his forefathers were so cruelly torn, and they commend the Freedmen of America to the sympathies and prayers of the Scottish people. The General Assembly have heard with the liveliest satisfaction that steps are being taken to bring into closer fellowship the several branches of the Presbyterian Church in America, at the very time when discussions on the same subject were going on among themselves; they earnestly pray that these common movements on both sides of the Atlantic may in God's good time reach a successful issue, without any

compromise of divine truth, and with a large increase of spiritual life and efficiency in the various departments of the Church's work. In conclusion, the General Assembly commend the Evangelical Churches of America to God and the word of His grace, praying that a rich and ample blessing may rest on their endeavours to advance the kingdom of Jesus Christ among that vast and heterogeneous population, which is spreading so rapidly over their continent as well as on those missions to foreign lands, which have already borne such precious fruit in the conversion of souls."

EVENING SEDERUNT.

SABBATH-SCHOOLS.

Mr WM. DICKSON, (elder,) convener, presented the report of the committee on Sabbath-schools, the substance of which is as follows:—

"In regard to statistics, the committee report that further encouraging progress continues to be made. Returns have been received from the whole 71 Presbyteries of the Church—made to the committee either by corresponding members appointed specially for that purpose, or, failing such appointment, by the Presbytery clerk of the bounds. In 37 Presbyteries, these returns are complete; in 34 Presbyteries, they are more or less defective. The committee have reason to believe that much encouragement has been afforded alike to parents, teachers, and scholars, by conferences with teachers, visitations of schools, and other means in some cases already adopted, expressive of the Presbytery's interest in the young within their bounds. Although completed totals cannot be presented to the Assembly, the committee think it right to give the following figures as what may be regarded as approximately correct:—Number of Sabbath-schools, 1681. Senior classes, 765. Sabbath-school teachers—males, 6047; females, 5716—total teachers, 11,763. Scholars at Sabbath schools—males, 52,164; females, 58,002—110,166. At senior classes—males, 7590; females, 10,830—18,420. Total scholars, 128,586. Copies of *Children's Record* regularly circulated monthly in the Sabbath-schools, 33,130. The committee would only further refer to the subject of juvenile contributions to the missionary and other schemes of the Church. These this year exhibit a considerable increase in every one of the ten several objects to which contributions have been made—the total amount for the year, chiefly gathered by the missionary-box in the Sabbath schools, being no less than £1018, 7s. 3¼d. In connexion with this, the committee would again urge the importance of the uniform circulation among the Sabbath-schools of the Church of the *Children's Record*."

After reading the report, Mr DICKSON said—More than twenty years ago, a remark was made by Dr Cunningham at a meeting of Sabbath-school teachers in Edinburgh which gave much encouragement. It was to the effect, that the time seemed come when it would be the duty of the Church to consider and define the precise position which the Sabbath-school ought to hold in her ecclesiastical system. Formally, that question has never yet been settled; but I suppose it may be held to be year by year coming to be practically adjusted. I fear it may appear to some as if the Sabbath-school committee had been unduly persistent in the matter; but it has been with them, as I suppose it often is with an individual Christian man, that the more closely he applies himself to any

one branch of work directly bearing upon the salvation of souls, the more fully he comes to realise its magnitude and importance; and so he may seem to be unduly exalting the object for which he pleads, while the explanation simply is, that he may possess special opportunities for estimating the importance of the interests which it involves. Under the authority of many successive Assemblies, the Sabbath-school has now been distinctly included in the Presbyterial action of the Church, and that to some extent with such heart and completeness that were the example followed, as I take leave to say under the Assembly's injunction it ought to be followed, by every congregation and Presbytery of the Church, the committee might soon be discharged, because little or nothing would be left for them to do. Meanwhile, I may say that any suggestions for future use, either as to statistics or on any other branch of this subject, will be thankfully received by the committee. Let me refer, in a word, to the subject of juvenile contributions to the missionary schemes of the Church. It may be gratifying to the Assembly to know how the exceptionally large increase this year has occurred. A letter to the children by Mr Wilson of Barclay Church, in the *Children's Record* of January last, proposed that they should raise £300 for a travelling equipage-outfit for the Gond and Nagpore Mission. A letter from Mr Wilson in the number for June announces that the thing has been done—the £300 has been raised. (Applause.) Moderator, I would ask the Assembly to mark the number of Sabbath school teachers at work in connexion with the Church. I never like, sir, to try to gain interest for any one Christian object by pitting it against another. If they are really schemes warranted by the Word of God, they can all of them well afford each to be pleaded for upon its own merits. Yet it is surely cause for thankfulness to think of the large increase to the effective agency of the Church—to the ordained ministry on the one hand, and to our week-day teachers on the other—afforded by these 12,000 volunteer labourers. (Cheers.) But it may be said, "Yes; but who are they? Probably, for the most part, only women—young ladies, and girls, who have little else to do." Sir, even were this true, would they be the worse for that? But it is not so. I well know that, ever since the days when that loving company followed Jesus from Galilee, and ministered to Him of their substance, wherever patient, unobtrusive, trouble-taking labour was concerned, female disciples have been the faithful upbuilders of the Church of Christ—(applause)—but it is a noticeable feature that, of the 11,763 teachers which these returns embrace, 6047, or more than one half, are male teachers. These figures are important, and show the vast breadth of quiet work going on in our Sabbath schools. But such statistics, however interesting, and even sometimes sensational, and however much it be the duty of the Church to possess them, are often, we know, little better than illusory for any sure indication of spiritual results. And so it is to the quality, even more than to the quantity, of this great agency that I think we ought so hopefully to look. Comprising, as it generally does, the warmest young life of a congregation, our ministers know that it is from these 6000 men that they most reliably look for new elders, deacons, and even students for the ministry. And no one, sir, knows better than yourself, from your long experience in connexion with our Home Mission Scheme, how largely many of our territorial congregations owe their existence, under God, to the work of the Sabbath-school. And it is not only by direct

fruit in the conversion of souls that the work is to be valued ; though even this year there are various places where an unmistakable work of grace is going on in our Sabbath-schools. But in these giddy and free-thinking days, when, as was well said by the convener of the Education committee, there seems a widespread relaxing of all sense of obligation to authority, both toward God and toward man, surely it is of surpassing importance that our young should be trained in a sound and solid knowledge of Bible truth. We cannot, it is true, make the living water flow ; but we can, as it were, have the pipes all laid and ready, so that when the blessing comes, there shall be sound doctrinal knowledge to receive and retain it. In the history of the awakening in Ireland in 1859, in Scotland in the year after, and in the recent and present reports of the committee on religion and morals, ample testimony is found to the fact that the most reliable and satisfactory cases of conversion were those of persons who in youth had been well grounded in doctrinal truth, whether by parental training or in the Sabbath-school. Further, it is interesting to observe that, abroad as well as at home, the importance of this work is being more and more fully recognised. In the report, for example, of the colonial committee, I find spontaneous reference made this year to its usefulness at Malta, Honduras, Natal, and other places. But it may be asked, What, then, can the Assembly do for the direct promotion of this cause ? So long as the committee is left without funds, which it has hitherto all its life been, I do not see that it can do much beyond renewing such deliverances as have already been given, and requiring that these be uniformly implemented. There is, however, one practical suggestion contained in the report which I trust the Assembly will adopt, that of a brief address to Sabbath-school teachers in name of the Assembly. There is another subject to which, in a word, I would beg leave to refer—the proposal alluded to by Dr Duff on Friday evening for a travelling Sabbath-school agent. Of this proposal the Assembly has no formal knowledge, and, therefore, I do not ask the Assembly to endorse it. But if it be carried out, and if, as is probable, the agent be a devoted man, whose experience in the work well fits him for stirring up an interest in the cause, and for helping in the organisation of schools, may I bespeak for him a welcome from brethren throughout the country wherever it is felt that his aid may be of service. (Applause.) Moderator, I grudge every minute that I detain the House—(cheers)—but I have only one other suggestion to make. I believe there are few congregations in which this work is not regularly remembered in prayer. But might not this be done in the family, as well as in the pulpit ? Now, what may be done at any time is apt not to be done at all, and the suggestion is, that regularly every Sabbath morning, at family worship among all our people, a blessing might be asked on the work of the Sabbath-school. (Applause.) Moderator, there are those among us who may think that it needs much argument to prove that the week-day education of our children, even in Bible schools, is a proper scheme for our Church. I do not think so, but we know there are some who do. But surely, sir, it needs no argument to prove that it is the duty of the Church to see to the spiritual care of the young of her flocks, if not by the Sabbath-school, then by some better means, and these, I believe, have not yet been discovered ; to discharge the obligation, no less really undertaken by the Church on the one side, than by the engaging parents on the other, when

those children were by baptism admitted within her pale. There was a touching incident mentioned at our Sabbath-school meeting last week, by a devoted friend of this cause from America. A little Christian boy lay on his deathbed. Calling his father to him, he said—"Father, I am going to heaven. When I see Jesus, I will say to Him that ever since I can remember anything, you were always trying to get me to come to Jesus." What a precious testimony was that to the tender faithfulness of a Christian father! and what a precious testimony would it not be to our Free Church of Scotland, to her ministers, Sabbath-school teachers, and godly parents, if, as one by one those under her care, whether old or young, were passing away from this world, they could say to her, with their dying breath—"I will tell Jesus that, ever since I can remember anything, you were always trying to bring me to Christ." (Applause.)

Mr BROWN DOUGLAS, (elder,) after noticing the painstaking labour which Mr Dickson, the convener, bestowed on this work, and the obligation under which the Church lay to him, expressed a regret that the statistical returns were not more complete, in consequence of answers not having been sent, and hoped that more attention would be paid by Presbyteries to this subject, as it was desirable, at stated intervals, to have precise and accurate information. He could not help also expressing how much he felt that they were indebted as a Church to the whole system of Sabbath-schools, and how much they were indebted to those who so perseveringly and laboriously worked in their Sabbath-schools. They might rejoice that throughout Scotland they had the personal superintendence and ministrations of 900 ministers of the Free Church. They might rejoice that God had put it into the hearts of their people to contribute no less than an average of £1000 a day for the promotion of the gospel at home and abroad; but to his mind there was no greater subject of thankfulness than that they had between 11,000 and 12,000 teachers, young men and young women engaged in trade and business and professions, giving a little time every Sabbath evening to the teaching of the young in those precious truths which they had themselves learned; and who, while acting on the scriptural principle, "freely ye have received, freely give," had also, he trusted, verified the great gospel promise, "In watering others, you shall yourselves be watered." (Applause.) It was a good sign of a living Church when they had such a great number of young men and young women, and some who had had the experience of half a century, working in this part of the Lord's vineyard. (Applause.) It had ever been recognised by the Church that it was not only the duty of parents to attend to the religious education of their children, but that the Church itself was charged by the Lord to feed His lambs as well as His sheep. It could not, therefore, but be gratifying to Christian parents, who feel it a duty to take their children to worship in the house of God, if, in every Sabbath service, and in each part of it, there was a remembrance of the little ones being present as well as older members of the Church. The Sabbath-school committee were thankful for the interest which was taken by Presbyteries in Sabbath-school work. He believed they realised, as the committee did, that there was a double blessing connected with this work—a blessing resting on the teacher, and a blessing on the children; and many a teacher could from experience testify to the good which he derived from his work and in preparation for it, and to the benefit which children

derived from the direct personal application of truth, often more easy in the class than in the pulpit. Among other advantages connected with Sabbath-schools was the companionships which through them were formed between those who were engaged as teachers; and who could tell how many influences for good were thus conferred on young men and young women? (Applause.) The work was, in every respect in which they could view it, a most blessed one. Mr Brown Douglas concluded by moving:—"The Assembly approve of the report, and record their thanks to the sub-committee, especially to Mr William Dickson, the convener; and re-appoint the sub-committee, with Mr William Dickson as convener. The Assembly record their continued satisfaction with the large measure of interest and attention bestowed on the subject of Sabbath-schools by many of the Presbyteries and Synods of the Church; renew their former earnest recommendation to such Presbyteries and Synods as have not yet taken action in this matter; and enjoin upon all ministers to give their careful and punctual attention in making statistical returns in reference to Sabbath-schools when required, whether by Presbyteries or by the Sabbath-school committee. Further, the Assembly remit to the sub-committee on Sabbath-schools to prepare an address to Sabbath-school teachers, for encouragement and guidance in their duties, to be submitted to the commission in November; and if approved, instruct the committee to take steps for the circulation of the same throughout all the Sabbath-schools of the Church."

Dr RAINY, who was received with applause, seconded the motion. He was sure it was the unanimous feeling of the Assembly that if there was anything they could do to convey the conviction to the minds of their Sabbath-school teachers that they regarded their labours as of momentous importance, and desired to encourage them in every part of their work, the Assembly would be willing to do what was necessary to establish that conviction in their minds. It was of the greatest importance that this Assembly, as well as the teachers, should feel the work in which they were engaged to be a work on which very great results depended. To a very large extent, the instruction of their young people in the knowledge of the Scriptures must depend on the efficacy, thoroughness, and faithfulness of the labours of Sabbath-school teachers. How much, therefore, depended on the teachers and superintendents, and the prayerful seeking of the blessing—for of those who became true servants of Christ, a very large number became so in virtue of early impressions and early training. He thought the Presbyteries should, in accordance with the repeated recommendations of the Assembly, give more oversight to the Sabbath-schools in their bounds. Even a little oversight might be of great importance by directing the minds of ministers and congregations to the subject, and thus lead to a providing of the proper number and quality of the Sabbath-school teachers. A mass of Scripture instruction was imparted to young people through Sabbath-schools, even when the work was performed in a somewhat perfunctory manner. But that might prove to be more hardening than beneficial; and nothing was of more importance for getting the best teachers than by the Presbyteries taking such action as to show that the Church realises the importance of their work, and earnestly desires and prays that they may be helped to go about it in the right way, so as to throw upon them a greater feeling of responsibility. Even the calling for Sabbath-school statistics

on the part of Presbyteries might have a beneficial effect, for perhaps it was not to be expected that they could make a very minute inspection of the schools. He thought they should as an Assembly give expression to their sense of the importance of this matter. (Applause.)

PASTORAL ADDRESS TO FOREIGN MISSIONARIES AND NATIVE CHURCHES.

Dr DUFF then submitted the pastoral address, which had been drawn up by a special committee of members of Assembly, for the purpose of being transmitted to missionary agents and native churches in the foreign field. He stated that it consisted of two parts—the first addressed to missionaries and other agents, the second to the pastors and members of native churches. Being the first pastoral of the kind which had ever emanated from the Assembly of the Free Church, the greatest possible pains were bestowed on the preparation of it. Besides, it was a document intended not merely to be profitably read by existing missionaries, or by the members of the existing churches, but by the successors of the former and the descendants of the latter. For the satisfaction of the Assembly he might state that if there was one distinctive feature which characterised the twofold address more than another, it was its intensely scriptural character. Almost every sentiment, counsel, and exhortation, was sealed home by some apposite text or texts from the sacred oracles. This feature was, in his opinion, of the utmost importance in the present age, when they considered the way in which Holy Scripture was evacuated of all meaning by Ritualists on the one hand, and contemptuously repudiated altogether by Rationalists on the other. To show the comprehensive character of the address he would now indicate the different parties for whose benefit it was designed. There were lessons and admonitions for our ordained missionaries, European and native, more particularly on the subject of prayer and the ministry of the word; with some additional counsels of a specific kind to native missionaries and the pastors of native churches. Then followed instructions and encouragements to the other labourers associated with these—medical missionaries, evangelists, and catechists; teachers of missionary schools, alike male and female, and writers for the press. The second part of the address was for the members of native churches, showing that the Lord Jesus required and expected that they should be witnesses for God before the world; that they should take a deep and practical interest on the spiritual and everlasting welfare of all around them; and that, with more peculiar care, they should cultivate those graces, and practise those virtues, which were the strangest to their heathen countrymen, and the most directly opposed to the vices which chiefly prevailed among them. In order to all this they were affectionately exhorted to wait diligently on all divine ordinances and means of grace—such as the reading of the Word, meetings for prayer, and Christian fellowship, the holy observance of the Sabbath, and secret prayer. The constitution of the family life, and the duties of the Christian household, were then fully pointed out—such as parental prayer for and with the children, parental instruction, parental example, and parental government. The whole was then wound up by an earnest and affectionate address to the children of native converts. The appropriateness of such a conclusion might not appear in its full significance to those unaccustomed to the polity and modes of thought prevalent in India and other eastern climes, where the Brahmans and the learned generally were

ever apt to look down upon children as beneath their notice, with a view to instruction or acts of kindness. The example of Jesus in this respect, as in every other, was most notable, when He rebuked the disciples, who, actuated by the oriental instinct, forbade little children to be brought to Him for His blessing. He never knew anything more striking than to see how the natives were often affected by the contrast between the great Teacher of Christianity in His treatment of children, and the great teachers of their own idolatrous systems. Dr Duff here remarked that it was something providential to find this undesigned coincidence—that the concluding business of the Assembly had to do with the young in their Sabbath schools at home, and that in the conclusion of this address which he submitted for the adoption of the Assembly, there was the same care expressed for the young connected with their missions abroad. It was to him a matter of rejoicing that the Assembly was giving each year so much of its time and attention to this most important subject; for all history and experience tended to prove that to neglect the lambs of the flock would be to reap the bitter penalty in a lapsed and alienated Church, while the blessed reward of duly attending to this work would be found in a vigorous, thriving, renovated Church. (Applause.) Of late they had been hearing a great deal about the wonders of the Atlantic cable, which, palpably to the eye of sense, had united Great Britain, the mother country, with North America, peopled chiefly by her sons; and which by conveying, through the agency of the subtle electric fluid, messages of importance to the peoples on either shore, already one in race, language, and religion, tended to unite them more closely than ever in the bonds of a great social brotherhood, whose best interests were bound up in each other's highest welfare and prosperity, and whose friendly and cordial alliance would enable them not only powerfully to influence but virtually to regulate or even determine the destinies of the different kingdoms and dynasties of the earth. In like manner this pastoral address, now proposed to be sent forth from the General Assembly, representing as it does, in the eye of the world, the collective wisdom and piety of the Free Church of Scotland—to her foreign missionaries in India and South Africa, and to the churches gathered, by God's blessing, through their labours, from the ancient heathen civilisation of the one, and the ancient heathen barbarism of the other—might, without any very great stretch or effort of imagination, be regarded as a species of evangelical cable, well fitted to unite the mother Church at home with the infant and daughter churches abroad; and by conveying, through the agency of the still more subtle element of divine love wherewith it is surcharged, messages of heavenly wisdom, kindness and good will, tend to link them to us still more closely in the bonds of spiritual sympathy and affection, as well as by the reciprocal interchange of spiritual good offices, productive of blessed fruits, which might last not only through the vicissitudes of short-lived time, but through the boundless duration of eternal ages. (Applause.) Dr Duff then proposed that the Assembly approve the address, and send it as speedily as possible to the various missionaries and agents in India and Africa; that the Assembly instruct the foreign missions committee to furnish copies to each member of Assembly, and also to send along with the *Record* for July a copy of it to all the ministers of the Church not members of the Assembly; permitting the committee also, if they see fit, to print and circulate a limited number of

copies ; and further, that on the 21st of July, the day appointed for the collection for Foreign Missions, in those congregations where associations do not exist, special prayer be offered up in *all* the congregations of the Church that the Divine blessing may accompany this address.

The motion was adopted.

ADDRESS ON PREVAILING ERRORS.

Mr W. WILSON then proposed that the Assembly approve of the pastoral address on Prevailing Errors, and that all ministers and probationers be instructed to read it to their respective congregations on an early Sabbath after it has been received.—Agreed to.

THE LATE MR PAUL AND MR H. DUNLOP.

The Assembly called for the proposed minute regarding the late Mr Robert Paul and the late Mr Henry Dunlop. The report thereanent was laid on the table by Dr Wood, convener of the committee appointed in the forenoon, and approved of. In accordance therewith the General Assembly declare as follows :—

“ Since last General Assembly, it has pleased God to deprive the Free Church of Scotland of two of her most honoured elders. One of them, Mr Robert Paul, has gone down to the grave in a good old age, fully ripe. We are sad when we think that we shall never again have his patriarchal presence among us. Yet, why should we mourn? for we know that he has gone to the place whose inhabitants are always young, and whose mortality is swallowed up of life. Mr Paul was a son of the manse ; and though grace is not hereditary, yet he, a child of many prayers, was a man of God from an early age. He was endowed with a strong natural understanding. He had a mind carefully cultivated, and he was continually adding to its stores by reading and reflection. Of first-rate business talents and habits, he took a foremost place among business men, whether the work in hand related to the business of the world, or of the Church of Christ. His love for the Free Church of Scotland was great. Much he worked for her, and much he prayed for her ; and very much did he do to strengthen her by his sagacious counsels and the weight of his personal character. Who that knew him but must have been struck with his ardent and unassuming piety, his kindly humour, his gentle playfulness, and, withal, the firmness and decision of his principles. In the days of conflict he could always be relied on, both for counsel and action. But he seemed to be happiest when the storm and the strife was over, and when all that was needed was to be kind and loving. That is what he has now to the full—the rest, the peace, the joy, the companionship of the saints which he valued and enjoyed so much when on earth, the joys of his Lord. We miss him greatly at our committees and in our Assembly, but we need not, and we will not mourn him ; rather let us seek to follow him, as one who, through faith and patience, is now, even at this present, inheriting the promises.

“ In the death of Mr Henry Dunlop the Free Church has lost another most estimable and useful elder. Mr Dunlop combined the humble earnest Christian with the able active man of public life. He was ever ready at the call of duty, and in the discharge of difficult public duties, which at several periods of his life devolved on him, he combined courtesy with firmness in an eminent degree. Though he was not far from the threescore years and ten, he died, as we are apt to think, all too

soon for the Church and the community. But it was God's time, and it was best. We bow in humble acquiescence. 'The Lord giveth, and the Lord taketh away; blessed be the name of the Lord.'

Thereafter the General Assembly engaged in prayer, Dr Henderson conducting the devotions, at the Moderator's desire.

APPOINTMENT OF NEXT GENERAL ASSEMBLY.

The next General Assembly was appointed to be holden at Edinburgh on Thursday the 21st May 1868.

APPOINTMENT OF COMMISSION.

The General Assembly appointed a commission, consisting of all the members of Assembly, and of Principal Fairbairn of the New College, Glasgow, named by the Moderator, with power and instructions, in the usual form.

THE MODERATOR'S CLOSING ADDRESS.

The MODERATOR then addressed the Assembly as follows:—

Fathers and Brethren,—I congratulate you on the proceedings of this most important Assembly, now happily concluded. To preside over your deliberations has been one of the greatest happinesses of my life; and I thank God, by whose good hand upon me I have been upheld to the close. You can with difficulty imagine what a satisfaction it affords, after an enforced absence from our General Assemblies for several years, to mark, on one's return, the order and decorum of your proceedings, and withal the frank and open expression of opinion by which they have been distinguished, together with the undiminished energy and ability with which the affairs of the Church in all their departments continue to be conducted. Indeed, we have had in this Assembly, and that, too, on the part of comparatively young members of this Court, displays of ripe theological learning, of discriminating judgment, loftiness of tone and aim, manly and vigorous eloquence, and electric rapidity of thought and reply, that vividly reminded me of the noblest debates of the Disruption controversy, and which afford assurance for the future that, whether in a united or separate Church, the cause of truth and righteousness shall not fail through want of able and eloquent advocates. (Cheers.) As my wish is to invite your attention during the brief remainder of our time to certain points which seem to me of urgent importance in the present circumstances of our Church, I the more readily abstain from any attempt to rehearse or review your proceedings—a task for which I am not qualified. And, indeed, if I were, it would be needless and unprofitable. The union vote, for example, speaks for itself with an emphasis no words of mine can augment. It says to all the friends of the movement, as God commanded Moses to say to the Israelites at the Red Sea, "that they go forward." (Applause.) Let us hope that in His kind providence He will yet make the path of duty so plain that we shall pass over into the promised land of union an unbroken host, not a hoof being left behind. (Applause.) These great spiritual movements are really, after all, little under the control of human wisdom. They are the work of Him in whose hand are the hearts of men, and who turneth them as rivers of water for the accomplishment of purposes which we cannot in the meantime fathom.

And the attitude which it becomes the believer to maintain in regard to them is that of Paul, "Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?" What are we, that we should withstand God? I have said that I shall not attempt to review your proceedings. If I make one exception, I am sure it will not be supposed that I do so in the way of personal allusion to the brother whom the case concerns. Nothing could be farther from my thoughts. No; I rejoice to say that Mr Smith has many, many warm friends in the Free Church of Scotland, of whom I am one, who esteem and admire him; who would deplore the loss to the cause and service of Christ in connexion with our Church, of his gifts and accomplishments; and who cherish the conviction that, through the grace of God, he will speedily emerge from this transitory cloud into a brighter sky than ever, and be upheld in the spiritual firmament as a star in the right hand of Christ. (Applause.) I allude to his case—involving, as it did, a question of doctrine, or rather of the wrong or right statement of doctrine—simply as offering a not inappropriate occasion to address a few words of affectionate counsel, suggested by the religious spirit and character of the age, to those who must ever be objects of the deepest interest to a Free Church Assembly, namely, our students, the future hopes of our Church and country. (Applause.) Although I only repeat what they are accustomed to hear much better said by their stated instructors, yet, the circumstances of time and place, and the fact that I speak what lengthened observation and experience have forced on my attention, may incline them to lend a favourable ear to the voice of affectionate admonition. Let me say, then, to our young friends, as you would not enter on the duties and responsibilities of the ministry raw and unfurnished—as you would not that your trumpet should give an uncertain sound—let your present years be spent in acquiring a thorough mastery of the literature of your profession. Whatever your sympathy with modern thought, and the pursuits of general literature and philosophy—and this every wise counsellor would encourage—yet let it be a matter of conscience with you, that the period of your theological course shall be sacredly given to its proper and peculiar work, and shall be employed in forming habits of assiduous study, and in cultivating a knowledge of the Church, and a hearty sympathy with her, in her history, her theology, and her work at home and abroad. Let your views with regard to all the fundamental doctrines of the Christian faith be thoroughly digested and settled; and with respect even to the language in which you clothe them, do not think it a thing antiquated and obsolete to tread in "the old paths, where is the good way." Be neither afraid nor ashamed, in these days of negative theology, to speak to the people in the phraseology familiar to them from their childhood, of the covenants, and imputed guilt and imputed righteousness, and original sin, and free grace, and election, and regeneration, and conversion, and effectual calling, and the atonement by the sacrificial blood of Christ, and an eternal heaven after death, or an eternal hell. If the terms in which these truths are ordinarily expressed fall into disuse, the truths themselves will soon be lost sight of, and men's minds will become a blank as to all positive and influential religious beliefs. (Applause.) Moreover, as one of your professors has most justly observed, and as you will see confirmed the more you acquaint yourselves with the history of

doctrines, "the technical language of theology which Sciolists are anxious to disuse, has been the slow growth of a conviction on the part of the Church, taught by many a controversy with error, that the established forms of expression are the best, if not the only ones suited accurately to express and securely to guard the truth." While a careful study of the writings of the Puritans will greatly enlarge and exalt your knowledge of theology as a science, where, I would ask on purely literary grounds, will you meet with finer specimens of profound thought, elaborate analysis, lively and appropriate imagery, purity, simplicity, and elevation of style, than in the works of such men as Goodwin, Owen, Bates, Baxter, and Manton? Let me further recommend to you to acquaint yourselves early with the practical work of the ministry. District prayer-meetings, adult Sabbath classes, territorial missions, all furnish a school in which may be profitably learned that homilitic use of the Scriptures, and that facility in popular address, and in public appearances generally, which some of our best ministers lose more or less of the first years of their ministry in acquiring. Dr Blaikie very pertinently referred yesterday, in connexion with the Home Mission report, to certain conferences, held in London a few months ago, between ministers of various Christian Churches and a large number of representative working men, with the view of ascertaining why so large a proportion of the latter are habitually alienated from the public worship of God. Happily, as my friend observed, the evil complained of does not exist amongst us, in at all the same extent to which it seems to prevail in the south. And where non-church going habits do form the rule in Scotland, they can in a large measure be accounted for by the guilty and long-continued neglect of the Church herself to provide for the spiritual wants of a rapidly-increasing population. Various reasons may be assigned for the greater prevalence of Church attendance among the working classes of Scotland; such as, the national reverence for the Sabbath as a day of religious rest and improvement; the popular character of our Presbyterian system; and the fact that the ministers of a Presbyterian Church do not affect sacerdotal dignity and functions, but are content to stand on the same level with their people, and to sympathise with them, as men subject to like passions, and corruptions, and temptations with themselves. (Applause.) But I allude to the subject here for the purpose of earnestly recommending to our students the cultivation of a style of preaching fitted to find its way to the understanding and heart and conscience of our working men. Assuredly one of the grandest achievements of a Church, and a noble testimony to her energy and usefulness, is when she succeeds in gathering this class into her ranks; when the gospel being preached to the poor, "the common people hear it gladly;" and the mass of the population thus becomes leavened with Christian principle. But it is not ordinary preaching that will accomplish this most desirable result. Mere verbal prettinesses, artificial flowers, will not do it. Wire-drawn metaphysical disquisitions will not do it. The rambling volubility of extemporaneous address will not do it. (Laughter and applause.) No; but let the preacher deal with the grand truths of the gospel, carefully digested, vividly illustrated, and faithfully applied, and let him pour forth the fruits of conscientious study from a heart overflowing with sympathy with toiling, suffering humanity, and, as has been proved over and over

again in connexion with our territorial efforts, crowded and interested congregations of working people and their families will be gathered into the house of God—congregations which in their religious earnestness and missionary activity and liberality may furnish models for imitation to the whole Church. (Applause.)

But it is time that I should now address myself to a question which not unreasonably begins to awaken concern in the bosom of the best friends of the gospel cause. The question is, By what means is our expanded and expanding Church, with all her schemes and agencies, to find that ever-increasing support which her continual extension demands? No one, I think, can consider what is needed in order to our retaining the ground we have already gained on both the home and foreign fields, and, still more, in order that we may extend the triumphs of the Cross at home and abroad, without a conviction that the time has come when the question must be deliberately taken up by the Church, What can and ought to be done to establish on the part of our people generally a higher style of Christian liberality? The urgency of this question is being felt by other Churches as well as our own. "A revolution in Christian finance," says an esteemed minister of the United Presbyterian Church, "is needed in the present day; and it is fast coming. All classes of men are feeling its importance." When it does come, "the greatest—nay, almost the only remaining obstacle to the spread and support of the gospel, all over the world, will be taken out of the way." I long to hasten on this much-needed revolution. I would rejoice that our Free Church should occupy the van in her efforts to promote it. She would thus render another invaluable service to the cause of the gospel. And if I devote to this subject a portion of this address, I do so in no querulous and unthankful spirit for the progress made of late years by our own and other Churches in the fulfilment of what we all hold to be "the essential and perpetual obligation which Christ has laid on all His people to support and extend His Church by free-will offerings." Since the severance of our connexion with the State, what marvels have we not seen in the way of Christian effort? We have seen repeated again and again the generous deed of the centurion of whom the Jews testified, "He loveth our nation, and hath built us a synagogue." In less than a quarter of a century we have seen nine hundred congregations supplied with suitable churches, and a large number of them with manses and schools, by means of private liberality. We have seen an annual revenue of £120,000 raised for the support of the ministry from the same source; three colleges erected and partially endowed; and, for the various objects of our Church, a total contribution reached of nearly £400,000 a year. (Applause.)

But nothing, perhaps, in recent times, affords a more remarkable illustration of the growth of a spirit of Christian liberality within our Church than the financial history of our Foreign Mission Scheme, to which, if the Assembly will indulge me for a few minutes, I shall briefly advert, for the sake of the lessons to be learnt from it. In 1825, the committee appointed by the General Assembly in the previous year to devise a plan for the establishment of a mission to the heathen, recommended that "there ought to be an extraordinary collection, without delay, in all the parishes of Scotland;" and, as appears from the report of that year, a

quinquennial collection was the utmost aimed at, the idea of an annual collection not being thought reasonable or practicable! In 1827, three years after the resolution to send a mission to the heathen, Dr Inglis was ashamed to confess (in his report to the Assembly) that "the means thus employed had in a great measure failed of success." "Out of more than 900 parishes and 55 chapels of ease, the collection has hitherto been made in no more than 59 parish churches and 16 chapels." In 1829, five years after the resolution to establish a mission in India, the aggregate fund accumulated from special donations, annual subscriptions, and congregational collections, with interest, amounted to about £3700, while £1300 had been reported as contributed by friends at Calcutta and Bombay. With this fund, most of which was to be kept as a reserved fund, or capital, the Assembly of 1829 ventured to appoint their first missionary to India. Four years thereafter, (1833,) Dr Inglis in writing to Dr Duff, expressed the joyous hope that a third labourer might soon be sent out, since from all sources he thought he could now reckon on a revenue of £1200 a year. Dr Duff's reply was what all would have expected of him. Overwhelmingly impressed with what he had by that time seen and experienced of the magnitude of the field, he, in substance said, "Oh, do not fix on £1200 a year as your minimum! Put down £10,000 a year as your minimum; and from that rise up indefinitely, without fixing any maximum at all!" (Cheers.) It shows the miserably contracted notions of Christian duty and responsibility then entertained, that when the letter which contained this remark was circulated among the members of the home committee, one of the most respected of them was so astounded by it that on the margin he made the following entry with his pencil: "What! is the man mad? Has the Indian sun turned his head?" (Laughter.) But to draw this instructive history to a close, (the facts of which have been vouched to me by Dr Duff himself,) those of us who were privileged to be present will never forget the appeal which, on his first return from India, our devoted missionary made to the Church in the Assembly of 1835, and the effect of which was shortly after to raise the income of the Foreign Mission Scheme to about £5000. (Applause.) It continued at much the same rate to the time of the Disruption. But that memorable event gave it a fresh impulse. The very first year thereafter it rose to upwards of £6000, and the second year to £9957, very nearly Dr Duff's proposed minimum in 1833. (Applause.) Now, having these facts in view, my first feeling is, that it would be sinful to recall the past without the liveliest gratitude to the God of all grace; and my second is, that it would be no less sinful to distrust Him, or to distrust the liberality of our people, for the time to come. Let me here explain that the part of this address which follows, relating as it does to a subject that requires mature consideration, and that has much occupied my thoughts, was sketched before I left home. It turns out that I had fallen to some extent into the same line of statement and even of illustration which was pursued by Dr Buchanan, and especially by Dr Duff, in giving in their reports respectively on the Sustentation Fund and on Foreign Missions. But it appears to me that this, so far from diminishing, tends rather to augment any value which the statement of my views may possess as a third and independent, but harmonious, testimony on a subject of ever-

increasing importance and anxiety to the Church. True also that Dr Duff was able on Friday evening to report a slight improvement in the Foreign Mission Fund, but so slight as in no appreciable degree to affect my representations of fact or the force of my argument. Need I say how happy I shall be if I am enabled in any measure to prepare the Church cordially to respond to the appeals about to be made in connexion with the new plan for the improvement of the Sustentation Fund, and the enlarged contributions imperatively required by the increasing success of our foreign missions. In a spirit, then, at once of thankfulness and of hopefulness, I would respectfully request the attention of the Assembly and of the Church to these self-evident truths :

First, if our prayers are graciously answered, the work of our Church must grow. There must be a gradual extension of it at home and abroad. Who would wish it to be otherwise? Who would desire that our supplications for the advancement of the kingdom of Christ in the world should bring down no blessing from on High, and that, as the fruit of them, we should hear of no revivals of religion throughout the land, no new flocks of worshippers gathered in from our spiritually-destitute population, and no new openings abroad by which the Christian missionary may enter, armed with that mighty weapon by which God throws down the strongholds of sin and Satan? Again, if the work of our Church is conducted with the ability and energy which all desire to see devoted to the prosecution of it, it will and must grow. It will partake of the progressiveness of the spiritual life employed in the management of it. And we know how this is likened to "a grain of mustard seed, which grew, and waxed a great tree."

Whoever, then, values the fruit of prayer and pains will rejoice with his whole heart when he sees such fruit in the success of the Church's enterprises, in souls gathered to Christ through her instrumentality, and in a growing appreciation of the value of her services, and an increasing demand for them. But let every member of the Church reflect with all seriousness what this involves. If the work of the Church is to grow, the Church herself must grow in the grace of liberality. In proportion as God blesses her and makes her a blessing, He claims at the hand of her members more ample resources. Our income must keep pace with our needed expenditure, otherwise our work must be arrested or bankruptcy ensue. Our means remaining the same, the extension of our efforts and usefulness is impossible. And hence, if our Church and all her schemes are not to become stereotyped, she must forthwith aim at a higher degree of self-sacrificing devotedness, and a higher platform of Christian liberality.

This is not a mere imagination. Already it has begun to be realised. How painful was it to be told, in the course of last winter, that an emergency had arisen in connexion with the Foreign Mission Fund, in consequence of a deficiency of upwards of £2000. How distressing to learn that, for several years past, the regular income of the mission has made comparatively little progress, and that but for the precarious fruit of special appeals, donations, and legacies, it must have been curtailed instead of being extended. We rejoice to hear that all the English and American societies are progressive. But how ought the contrast to humble us, and provoke us to greater zeal, when told that our own has

been stationary, if not retrogressive? The same inadequacy of supplies, seeming to betoken a declining interest in the cause, distinguishes our home operations. Since last Assembly, the convener of the Church and Manse Building Fund published the complaint that, through lack of means to meet the claims made upon it, "the committee was put in a position in which it was impossible for them to take action, and had practically nothing to do." Nor is it creditable to us as a Church that the earnest and persevering efforts that have been made for twenty years by our most able, wise, and indefatigable convener to bring up the equal dividend from the Sustentation Fund to the moderate allowance of £150 per annum have hitherto proved unavailing; and that from the inadequacy of the fund, the claims of Church extension should have to come into competition with the claims of the existing ministry.

There are two ways of dealing with such financial crises as I have referred to, and which are so disheartening and paralysing to a committee and convener. The one is by a special effort to supply the deficiency—a measure painful even when successful, and apt to cause some irritation to the select few appealed to. The other way is the one suggested by worldly-wise counsellors, who would introduce the principles of worldly economics into the management of the Christian Church, and who recommend us accordingly to curtail our operations, to reduce our establishments, to dismiss some of our agents—a course which we would adopt at our peril, so long as the Spirit of God is continuing to bless these operations for their designed end, so long as millions of our immortal fellow-creatures are living without Christ, and so long as the commission given to the Church continues in force, "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature." Retrench our expenditure! Confine our operations within narrower limits! Dwarf our schemes! No; the position which we have acquired has been reached through too many difficulties, and by too arduous and costly sacrifices, to be so easily resigned; and, if our people will enable us, we shall continue to "hold that fast which we have, that no man take our crown." We shall try whether they, professedly "the children of light," cannot be prevailed on to emulate "the children of this world" in the self-denial with which they forego pleasures, and in the spirit of enterprise which they discover in the prosecution of their worldly designs; whether they will not prove that the love of God and of souls is as potent a principle as the love of wealth, and can plan and execute as noble and expensive undertakings with a view to the moral and religious good of men, as the other is daily planning and executing with a view to merely material interests. (Applause.)

It is difficult to suggest what practical measures should be adopted with a view to that increased exercise of the grace of liberality which the ever-expanding efforts of our Church demand. Hence the importance of the early and full consideration of the subject by Presbyteries, that the results of the varied experience of individual ministers may be stated and compared. And inasmuch as in this matter, as in every other of religious practice, the Word of God must be our rule, yet not a few ministers of the Word habitually evade the subject from a false delicacy or a sickly sentimentality, it might be well for Presbyteries from time to time authoritatively to enjoin that it shall be preached upon, on a fixed

day, from all the pulpits within the bounds. Moreover, let the children of our families, and congregations, and Sabbath-schools, be trained to the early habit of giving to the cause of God, and let the habit be founded on scriptural views of duty. And when young people are admitted to the communion of the Church, let them be instructed that one of the duties which Christ has made incumbent on them, is to support and extend it in a generous proportion to their means. I have the happiness of a personal acquaintance with Christian men of business who, by an article in their deed of copartnery, bind themselves to give a certain proportion of their yearly profits to the cause of piety and charity; and they speak with the utmost satisfaction of the advantages of the arrangement. Would that so Christian a practice were more general. (Cheers.) It is of immense importance, too, in giving to the cause of God to do so systematically, and to fix a positive standard. Of course no minister who would have his people to contribute intelligently and cheerfully will overlook the value of the press, and will fail by the circulation of the *Record* and other similar means to keep them informed as to the progress of the Church's works. Let me add, as practically useful, though apparently trivial suggestions—multiply the channels by which the gifts of the people may reach the treasury of the Church; let the collection be made frequently—above all, punctually; and let our members and adherents be indoctrinated in the principle which our venerated father, Dr Chalmers, was wont to illustrate with such visible satisfaction, “the power of littles.” This power is remarkably seen in the fact that, assuming the membership of the Free Church at 240,000, which leaves a large margin for those in straitened circumstances, one penny a day from each member would yield £365,000 a year for the Sustentation Fund; whereas the fund for 1865-66, as contributed by the associations, amounted to only £115,000 or £250,000 less. “How do you contrive to raise such immense sums for your foreign missions?” was once said to a humble follower of John Wesley. “Oh, sir,” was the reply, “it is the five points that do it all.” “And what are the five points?” “The first is faith in the Lord Jesus Christ; second, repentance unto life; third, gospel holiness; and the fourth and the fifth are a penny in the week and a shilling in the quarter.” (Laughter and applause.) I do trust that these details will not be thought unworthy of this occasion or of this place. My fathers and brethren will perceive from them that I have not a shred of sympathy with those men of a morbid and mistaken spirituality, who deem their lips defiled by any mention of money in connexion with the sacred affairs and interests of the Church. Money has no character of its own. It is simply a talent, and, according to the purpose to which the owner devotes it, may prove either an unmitigated evil or an unspeakable good to himself and the community. Hence the servant of Christ who neglects to inculcate on his hearers their solemn responsibility in connexion with the uses to which they apply it, fails in one of the first duties of his office. In particular, the financial details into which I have entered grow in magnitude and importance when we connect them with the urgent question how that glorious work is to be carried forward which brought the Son of God into our world, and the promotion of which He has committed to His Church, as that which is to engage all her sympathies and services, even

as they do His own. They disclose, moreover, what vast resources are available for the prosecution of this work, if only the Spirit of God were poured out from on high, to make us think more of the spiritual wants of perishing millions, and less of our personal comforts. In primitive times, it was not until after the day of Pentecost, and when "great grace was upon them all," that "as many as were possessors of lands or houses sold them, and brought the prices of the things that were sold, and laid them down at the apostles' feet." So in our own day, after all the scriptural arguments that we can urge, it is to be feared that, without a fresh baptism of the Spirit, no great and general advance will be made in the direction of a more adequate support of the Church and her schemes. But let our exalted Head bless us with a pentecostal effusion of His spirit, and then will a pentecostal spirit of bountifulness follow. For the bestowment of this blessing let us petition the throne of heavenly grace; and let us ask it in the connexion in which Chalmers prayed for it, when he said, "O Lord, put the grace of Christian liberality into the hearts of very many of the Church's friends; and as the fruit of powerful and efficient preaching, on the one hand, grant that, on the other, there may be willing hearers in readiness to place at the disposal of the Church's rulers what may be expedient for the Church's good."

In connexion with the subject of a revival of religion, to which these observations point, let me say, with no disposition to indulge in unwarrantable regrets and lamentations as to the low and dead state of religion among us, that, judging by the Bible standard, there are, nevertheless, many things in the religious aspects of the Church and the community which every friend of vital godliness must deplore. I speak not of the scepticism and indifferentism and practical ungodliness which so lamentably prevail outside the Church. But even within our congregations, it cannot be doubted that many are strangers to a saving work of the Spirit of God on their heart, and are living in worldliness, formality, and spiritual apathy. Of the whole number of our members, comprising not much short of 300,000 souls, how few comparatively are personally and actively enlisted in promoting Christ's cause. How many, on the contrary, are guilty of needless associations with the world, as a fruit of which their tone is lowered and their influence for good destroyed. Instead of the religion of knowledge, faith, duty, and Christian usefulness, there is substituted the religion of a barren orthodoxy that moves none of the springs of action; or the religion of mere form, in which the worshipper contents himself with the bare observance of ordinances, without having his soul brought in the use of them into contact with spiritual realities; or perhaps the religion of feeling and emotion, which, without either the knowledge of doctrine or the practice of duty, finds a pleasurable indulgence in the transitory impressions produced by the style in which gospel mysteries are set forth. Who, then, will question our need of awakening displays of God's power and glory in connexion with the preached Word? What cause for the prayer, "Oh! that thou wouldst rend the heavens and come down; that the mountains might flow down at thy presence!"

Now, if by such prayer as this we express our conviction that God alone can enrich us with more abundant measures of spiritual life and earnestness, it is not to be forgotten that His gracious interposition is to

be looked for in connexion with the use of means. And the means which He may warrantably be expected to bless are just His own institutions. These must not be displaced by instrumentalities of man's devising. If we are favoured with a genuine and permanent revival, it will be in connexion with a more earnest and prayerful employment of all the ordinances which Christ has appointed, and has promised to bless, for the conversion of sinners, and the instruction and progressive holiness of believers. (1.) Foremost comes the ministry of the Word, God's grand instrument for the salvation of men. With reference to this, says Fuller, "It is well known what sort of preaching it was that produced such great effects in many nations of Europe about the time of the Reformation. The reformers were so far agreed that the doctrines of human depravity, the deity and atonement of Christ, justification by faith, and sanctification by the Holy Spirit, were the great topics of their ministry." Again he says, "Since the Reformation all who have been eminently blessed to the revival of practical godliness, like their predecessors before-mentioned, have dwelt principally on the Protestant doctrines of man's lost condition by nature, and salvation by grace alone, through the atoning blood of Christ, together with the regenerating influence of the Holy Spirit." And if these doctrines, faithfully set forth, were honoured with such eminent success by the Spirit of God in past ages, we may depend upon it that, if we would see a return of the times of reviving and refreshing which through means of them were enjoyed, the same grand fundamental doctrine must continue to supply the subject-matter of our discourses. (2.) The eldership is a second institution of the Redeemer of invaluable importance to the spiritual prosperity of the Church. Let the duties of this office be discharged with fidelity, and wisdom, and Christian love; let the holder of it prove himself the Christian friend and spiritual counsellor of those committed to his charge; let him embrace every favourable opportunity which distress and death afford for impressing the lessons of the gospel on the subdued and softened mind; let him interest himself in the religious education of the young, at once their fatherly adviser and watchful guardian; and let his own character exhibit that personal religion and those domestic virtues which he inculcates on others, and what a mighty impulse must be given, by the united influence of thousands of such agents, to the revival of vital godliness, and the strengthening and settling of our people in the faith! (3.) The office of deacon, with respect to such effects, is only second in importance to that of elder. He who holds it is required to be a pattern of zeal in the cause of God. His motto should be, "Ye know the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, that, though he was rich, yet for your sakes he became poor, that ye through his poverty might be rich." When his visits among the flock are those of a man animated by such a sentiment, and such as the first deacons were—"of honest report, full of the Holy Ghost and wisdom"—few things can contribute more efficiently to keep alive a sense of the importance and value of divine things, a sincere regard for the interests of Christ's kingdom, and to maintain in a congregation a high spiritual tone and standard.

Finally, I would have all parents and heads of families in connexion with our Church to consider that, in every genuine and lasting revival, much must depend on the faithful discharge of duty by them. The

home is the nursery for the Church ; and in proportion as it is purified and elevated by Christian influences, we may expect the cause of religion to flourish in our land. And (as we are instructively reminded by the case of Lois and Eunice) as none have a greater fitness for the task, nor enjoy more favourable opportunities, so none are generally more honoured to uphold and perpetuate the knowledge and influence of vital spiritual religion in the world than pious women, and especially pious mothers. (Applause.)

By God's blessing on the means and influences to which I have referred, may we expect Him to communicate spiritual life at the first, and subsequently to maintain and increase it, among a people associated under Christian rule and order. Let the means be employed hopefully, in the confidence that He is willing to render them effectual. And should the blessing descend, and His work of revival prosper in any of our congregations or neighbourhoods, even though attended with accompaniments with which we would dispense, let us remember that it is not for us to sit in judgment upon it in a fastidious and captious spirit ; but to welcome it with grateful hearts, to separate what is sound and scriptural from its opposite, to foster it, and to direct and improve it to high spiritual ends. It is surely incumbent on the Church, having prayed for revival movements, to wait and watch for them in an expectant attitude—to look for them within her own borders, and to look also for those more general visitations of the Spirit which extend to the openly careless and ungodly, who have hitherto lived in shameless contempt of divine things. Instead of leaving such movements to the direction in many cases of inexperienced and unqualified persons, would it not far more honour the Spirit of God, prosper the work, and obviate evils that are apt to hinder it, were the Church, through her office-bearers and courts, to place herself at the head of it, as a work which God has committed to her guidance, requiring of her in its behalf the exercise of the same watchfulness and fostering care which He has promised to exercise toward herself? "I the Lord do keep it ; I will water it every moment : lest any hurt it, I will keep it night and day."

Fathers and brethren, I must now hasten to a close. The time has come for me to bid you all an affectionate farewell. I do so with an unfeigned sense of the kindness and courtesy which I have experienced at your hands as the occupant of this chair, and of the indulgence which has been extended to my defective performance of its duties. I do so also under a solemn impression that "all flesh is grass, and all the glory of man as the flower of grass." How changed the aspect of the Assembly to those who knew it in Disruption times! "Our fathers, where are they? and the prophets, do they live for ever?" "One generation passeth away, and another generation cometh." Yes, man dies ; but the cause of God lives, and will live on for ever ; and it is the one thing worth living for during the few short years of our pilgrimage. Oh let us part, cherishing the prayerful desire that this glorious cause may gain some impulse from our having lived on the earth ; and that, through our personal devotion to it, and the high moral and religious enterprise of those who come after us, when another twenty-five years of our Church's history shall have passed, though many of us shall then have been gathered to our fathers, the closing century may find Jerusalem a quiet

habitation, and peace upon Israel—our children united in the bonds of Christian fellowship and love, and walking in the fear of the Lord—our beloved country the fountain-head of all Christianising influences, the enlightener of the dark places of the earth, the protector of the persecuted, the sanctuary of the oppressed, the nurse of arts, the inviolable abode of peace and purity, of truth and virtue and freedom. (Much applause.)

The Assembly was then closed with praise and prayer at a quarter-past eleven o'clock.

2365TC

LBC

03-03-05 32180

665

MC





Princeton Theological Seminary Libraries



1 1012 01255 0408

