

adult paupers and criminals, it is essentially necessary that the skill should be communicated to them, and the habits formed in them. And hence the importance of the scheme that, by finding regular employment for the youthful paupers of the country, would rear them up in honest industrial habits, and thus qualify them for being useful members of society.

It has been alleged against Presbyterianism by excellent men of the English Church,—among the rest, by Thomas Scott the commentator,—that in its history in the past it has been by much too political, and has busied itself too engrossingly with national affairs. There can be little doubt that its history during the seventeenth and the latter half of the sixteenth century is very much that of Scotland. Presbyterianism *was* political in these days, and fought the battles of civil as certainly as those of religious liberty. During a considerable part of the eighteenth century it was *not* political. From the suppression of the Rebellion of 1745 to the breaking out of the great revolutionary war, the life led by the Scottish people was an exceedingly quiet one, and there were no exigencies in their circumstances important enough to make large demands on the exertions of the patriot or the ingenuity of the political economist. The people of the empire rather fell short than exceeded its resources, and were somewhat less than sufficient to carry on its operations of agriculture and trade ; and hence the comfortable doctrine of Goldsmith and Smollett regarding population,—a comfortable doctrine, for it never can obtain save when a nation is in comfortable circumstances. The best proof of the welfare of a country, they said, was the greatness of its population. It was unnecessary in such an age that Presbyterianism should be political. The pauperism which had deluged Scotland immediately after the Revolution had been all absorbed ; the people, in at least the Lowlands, were a people of good