

M E M O R I A L

Concerning the Conduct of the Presbytery of *Glasgow*, as to the Settlement of *Govan*; from the Beginning of that Affair in *May* 1746, till *September* 1747, wherein is shown.

I. That their Conduct was not the Cause of the Opposition to the Candidate, and cou'd not justly give any Encouragement to it.

II. That that Opposition was such, as gave strong Grounds for their not sustaining the Call to him.

III. That they have shewed much Regard to the Assembly's Decision, by their Endeavours to procure Submission to it.

IV. That there are very great Difficulties in the Way of proceeding further, while the Opposition continues such as it is at present: And that if the Settlement is made in the present Situation of the Parish, there will be still less hope of their Submitting to it afterwards.

THE Principles on which the Presbytery of *Glasgow's* Conduct in this Affair, has been founded, and which seem to be generally acknowledged in other Cases, are such as these. That the End of Church Authority and of the Pastoral Office is Edification: That this requires Submission on the Part of the People to the Ministration of Pastors: That such Sub-

mission must be voluntary and cannot be forced : That while there is no Prospect of obtaining it, but the greatest Reason to apprehend the contrary, instead of hurrying a Settlement, it is safest to use Delay ; to prevent if possible the involving any Corner in the Calamities of a violent Settlement.

By adhering to such Principles, The said Presbytery have not hitherto had so much as one violent Settlement among them since the Revolution. Notwithstanding of which, their Conduct as to *Gowan* has been represented by some in such a Light, as if it were a sufficient Argument even for hastening that Settlement ; that whatever be the Effects of it in the Parish, it seems a necessary Punishment of the Misconduct (or Partiality) of the Presbytry. Mean time while those their Accusers, at least some of them, impute the Opposition so much to the Presbytery, as to make the Parish comparatively innocent in that Matter : it seems hard to urge the punishing of the Innocent for the Guilty, there being other Ways to animadvert on the Conduct of Presbyteries, than by any Severities against those under their Inspection.

It is by no Means intended in this Paper to charge on all the Gentlemen, who have declared for this Settlement, every Misrepresentation that is here refuted ; or even every Thing of that Kind that has been advanced in publick Pleadings for their Cause. It is not at all so needful to consider who have chiefly framed or spread such Things, as it is to refute them, which not only is doing Justice to those injured by them, but also has some Tendency (at least) to other good Purposes.

It must indeed be expected that some will ask to what purpose ? Seeing this is a *Cause already judged* and finally determined ? To which it is answered that removing injurious Aspersions is a valuable Purpose



pose of it self. But besides this, it is by no Means a *Thing already judged*, that there must be no Delay, on any account whatever, in this Affair: Nor is any precise *Time* limited. And it is only on account of a Delay, joined with an Appointment of further travelling with the People, in Case of any hope of Success, that an Appeal has been made from the Presbytery. And it is well known that where a Delay is so necessary as in this Case, if it is granted, there are more Expedients than one, by which the Fears of a violent Settlement may possibly be disappointed, and that without Prejudice to the Decision made in this Affair.

It is a chief Misrepresentation of the Presbytery's Conduct, that it was the Cause of the Opposition. This is alledged not only without Evidence, but against so strong and manifold Evidence for the contrary, that the Allegation might justly cause no small Surprize; were it not that the Cause supported by it plainly needed some extraordinary Methods without which the Pleaders for it cou'd not but be at a great Loss for Arguments.

This one Argument, which imputes to the Presbytery, the Opposition made by the Parish, seems to be that on which the greatest stress has been laid; in Written Reasons of different Appeals; in the Memorial printed on that Side; and in Verbal Pleadings both in Publick and Private. It is therefore of Importance to consider that Accusation at some Length.

A chief Evidence against the Accusation is, that the Opposition was so well known, even to the Patrons themselves, before the Presbytery did or could do any Thing in the Affair: And continued to be so, before any of the *Interlocutors* complain'd of.

Of

Of this there are various clear Proofs.

1. About three Months or more, before the Presentation was given in, which was not till *May* 28. the Peoples strong Disinclination to the Candidate, was notified to the Rector of the University, a Gentleman much regarded in all that Corner and elsewhere ; by Heritors and Elders stated Hearers at *Govan*, with whom he had desired a meeting. It was first notified as a Thing sufficiently known to them : But besides this on a new private Trial made at his Desire it was farther confirmed ; first to him, and then both to him and other Masters of the College, at a meeting on that Affair.

To explain this early Disinclination to that Candidate, however good his Character is ; It is well known that whereas the Parish had heard him oft, during at least 6 or 7 Years before their former Minister's Death, The Disinclination appeared evident even then, which has been again and again declared to the Presbytery : who expressly take notice of this in their Answers to the Reasons of Appeal to the Assembly.

2. A Dissent against the Presentation to him founded on the Disinclination or Opposition as sufficiently notour, was entred in the College's Records.

3. After he was Presented, and before the *Interlocutors* complain'd of, very few heard him : And almost all even of those few were against him, as appeared plainly afterwards by their Votes. People's not hearing him is mentioned here, not as a thing to be justified : but only as a Proof of the Earliness and Strength of the Opposition.

4. It is another Proof of this, and it is only for that End it is mentioned, that as early as *July* 9th, the chief stated Hearers in *Govan*, appeared by their Procurator to dispute the Right of Presentation.

5 Thereafter

5. Thereafter a Delay was agreed on by both Sides till after Harveſt : Had not the Oppoſition been known to the Patrons, Is it not Obvious that inſtead of ſuch a Delay, they would have inſiſted for the Moderation of a Call and, if reſuſed, have appeal'd to the Synod in *October* 1746.

6. When the Delay was agreed on, the Patrons deſired of the other Side a farther Trial of the People, to ſee if the Oppoſition could be removed ; and after Harveſt it was reported to them that there were no hopes of it.

7. It was a ſtrong Proof of this that on *November* 5th. the ſame Day that the Moderation of a Call to the Preſentee was applied for: there was the like Application in favour of another Candidate, given in by *Haughead*, and ſign'd by 31 Heritors, and by himſelf and other ten Elders and Deacons : To which laſt Petition, *a great many Heads of Families in ſaid Pariſh were Subſcribing and concurring.* Theſe are the very Words of the Preſbytery's Records.

8. That the Oppoſition, previous to any *Interlocutor* of Preſbytery, was known to the Univerſity ; is own'd in their Memorial printed at *Edinburgh* in *May* laſt ; For there, ſpeaking of the time preceeding *November* 5th, it is ſaid that there were *unreaſonable Heats* viz: againſt the Candidate, which they affirmed were attempted to be raiſed by the Management of the Elders who, as they further alledge, had entered into an illegal Combination againſt him. But, by the by, the Preſbytery on narrow Inquiry could find no ground for this Charge.

But here great noiſe has been made by the Preſbytery's Opponents that, tho' there was, properly ſpeaking, no *Interlocutor* of Preſbytery in this Affair before *Nov.* 5th; the Strain and Tenor of their Conduct might or did promote the Oppoſition. Is it not evidently contrary

trary to common equity to lay stress on general reflections not supported by special Condescensions on Facts. None will find any thing in the Records, during all the time preceeding *Nov. 5th* but such things as these: The Presbytery's making the Candidate one of their Probationers: their sending him from time to time to preach at *Govan*: their agreeing at the College's desire and for their Convenience, to have a Meeting on purpose, on *June 18*, to see their Right; because it might be needful to return it soon to *Edinburgh*, their hearing Debates between parties about that Right and the like: During which time there might perhaps be some Reasonings among some Members about that Right which was not quite clear to them all: and some Expressions that at any rate it was not suitable for a Presbyterian Colledge to use such Right. But where is the partiality here? what Encouragement could justly be taken from this to oppose the Candidate; Does it not look as if People were straitned for Proofs of the Presbytery's promoting the Opposition when such things as these are made handles of? That Minister, and but one it was who expressed himself in this manner concerning a Presbyterian Colledge, made not the least Reflection against the Candidate. Instead of opposing him, he contracted Intimacy with him as early as Harvest 1746. He employ'd him to preach and spoke well of his Sermons. He communicated his favourable Impressions of him on different occasions. He publicly recommended him to the Parish both in a Speech before the Synod in *April 1747*: and by a Letter read at their Committee that travelled with that People in *Govan Church* soon after.

But a heavier Charge still has been brought against the Presbytery. Their severest Accusers not finding Ground enough from their publick Conduct before e

before *Nov.* 1746. to give Colour to the Charge of their promoting the Opposition, have accused them of no less than private tampering with the Parish: But what can be more contrary to all Equity than to allege this not only without Evidence, but against all such Evidence as the Refutation of such a Charge is capable of? For the thing is denied both by the Presbytery and by the Parish. And if it were true; how unlikely is it that the Secret would have been kept among so many Country People? especially when so much irritated, as at least some of them are, by the Presbytery's travelling with them since the Assembly's Decision.

But to proceed to what happened from *Nov.* 5th. 1747.

6 The Appointment on *Nov.* 5th. of a previous Trial of the People's Inclinations, instead of granting instantly the Moderation of a Call; cannot be blam'd as promoting the Opposition; because (1) in this they only followed their usual Method in like Cases. Which they had the less ground to condemn as they have been so long without any violent Settlements. (2) The Opposition had already appeared to be so very great: And so strong a Proof of it appear'd that very Day, by the above Petition on that Side then given in; that this it self is an Argument that the promoting of the Opposition was not the Design of appointing the Committee for that Trial. (3) Had that been the Design; Is it at all credible that the Presbytery would have put on that Committee the Ministers that were most intimate with the Candidate and whose willingness and Capacity to recommend him were above all Suspicion? and that they would have restricted the Trial to him alone? (4) At that Committee he was recommended, and that in

a strong Manner: And the People warned of the bad Consequences that might attend the Continuance of the Opposition: And this was done by a Member of the Committee who was more fit than many others to give such a Recommendation, because of his Intimacy with the Candidate: And when he had done and spoke to the Moderator about his inculcating these things on the People who were met: The Reply given was that the Recommendation given already was so full that farther Addition was Superfluous. Which surely was not a Refusal to recommend: nor a contradicting the Recommendation given. Notwithstanding of which the above Memorial for the University, publish'd and signed by their Lawyer, expressly says. "Nor would they recommend him at this same Sounding, although the Heritors declaring for him made together with those who were silent, an evident Majority."

In the University's Reasons of Appeal to the Assembly it was said that, "When it was proposed and desired in open Presbytry to recommend Mr. Thom, they expressly refused to do it." Yea in the above Memorial it is said that, "No Application from the University or Heritors could prevail with the Presbytery to recommend him."

The Defence against all this is? First, as is taken Notice of in the Presbytery's Answers to the Reasons of Appeal to the Assembly. "The Presbytery absolutely refuse the Fact: And put the Appellants to the Proof of it. They observe justly that, "there is no such thing in their Minutes: That "no such thing was ever transacted by them; what "any particular Member might say, on the different Proposals concerning the founding then under Consideration. (Nov. 5th) The Presbytery
are

“ are not to be blamed for : That it shows an Un-
 “ common Desire to find fault, when the Opinion of
 “ every Member must be held a Deed of the Pres-
 “ bytery, and put on their Score.”

As to what is said in the printed Memorial, which supposes that there were *repeated Applications* from the University and Heritors for such Recommendation ; It is hop'd these Gentlemen will by no means adopt that Allegation, as they must themselves be conscious, that there was never so much as any one Application of that kind made by them.

But to clear up the only Fact from which, it is apprehended, occasion has been taken for such objections : On *Nov* 5th. there was a Question whether the founding should be at large, or restricted to the Presentee ; while doing it at large was talk'd of a Member propos'd that the Committee should be instructed to recommend the Presentee because of our Embarrassment by the law of Patronage. Afterwards it was agreed without a Vote that the Sounding should be restricted to him : which being, of the different methods propos'd, the most favourable for him : The Member who had spoke as above about a founding, with an Instruction to recommend, and who at the founding actually did recommend, did not insist for the Presbytery's Judgment on this Proposal : Nor was any Judgment given about it.

But before this happened, and while the other method of a founding at large was talked of ; one Member, who alone is answerable for what he said, had an Objection against such a Precedent as above, of formally appointed Recommendations, not against free Voluntary ones. Any thing hinted by him against the former, had no more respect to the Presentee than to all other Candidates whatever. His Reasoning, which it seems must be called a refusal

of a Recommendation ; and not only a Refusal by him but by the Presbytery, Was so far from being liable to that Imputation, that it contained as good a Recommendation of the Candidate as could well be expected from him according to his Means of Knowledge of him. Speaking well of some Sermons he had lately heard from him ; and of good Accounts he had of his moral Character ; So that the Recommendation extended both to his Preaching and Practice.

This with the Publick Recommendations of him already mentioned ; and the Declarations made by several other Members of the Presbytery before the Synod, that they also had taken opportunities to recommend him, shews how little ground there is of Complaints, as if care had not been taken to do Justice to that young Man's Character. Perhaps there are few Cases where more Pains has been taken that Way : And this may justly make it seem amazing how much the above Memorial dwells on these complaints ; as if they were almost the chief Strength of the Cause : According to that Paper, the Refusal complained of encouraged a Combination ; No Application could prevail on the Presbytery to act otherwise : The Refusal is mentioned as a formal Step taken *in Place of granting a Moderation* when regularly applied for. And it is added as if the Refusal had been made also at the Sounding.

Whereas the Defences now made on this Head are fuller in some respect than that in the Presbytery's Answers to the Reasons of Appeal to the Synod ; there is this plain Reason for it, that they who composed these Answers, had not with them the Member who made the above Proposal, while sounding at large was talked of, and best remembered the Circumstances of it

It

It is proper to add here a short Extract from the Presbytery's Answers, to the Reasons of Appeal to the Assembly. There it is said, "The Presbytery beg leave to put the Appellants in mind of a Fact, which is not in our Minutes indeed, being kept out at their own Desire, but we hope will not be refused by them. They acquainted the Presbytery that they had agreed with the People in Opposition to them to have a Friendly Meeting to the End, they might endeavour to satisfy them that the University had good Right to the Patronage of the Parish of *Govan*, and desired that the Presbytery might appoint two of their Number to meet with them. This the Presbytery cheerfully complied with. And they Appeal to all Present at that meeting if the two Ministers did not answer the Expectation of the Appellants, in dealing with the Opponents to drop their Opposition."

In *December*, instead of granting instantly the Moderation of a Call, the Presbytery referred the Matter to the Synod. Against this Delay it may be Objected by those in the Opposition, that it gave the other Side Time and Opportunity to make their Call at least somewhat more plausible; without making it at all a good one: and without giving any Prospect of a comfortable Settlement.

But when it is objected that the Delay tended to the Increase of the Opposition, the Result of the Previous Trial seems to be forgotten by them. By that Trial it appeared that among all the stated Hearers in *Govan*, that is all those that attend there through the Year, and not merely in Sum-

mer, the Opposition appeared absolutely universal. Not one of that Character, Heritor, Elder or Head of a Family appeared for the Presentee: and indeed as to others of any Sort, the Number was not very considerable: Remarks to be made afterwards will make all this more clear.

If the Presbytery could be supposed to have intended to encrease the Opposition, it could not be among the Elders or Heads of Families: for none at all of the former Class, and but one of the latter Voted for the Presentee. It must have been then among either the *Garballs* Fewars, the six residing Heritors, or the Gentlemen now residing, who had appeared on that Side. But that the Presbytery should intend or propose, that the Delay would make any Number of them join the Opposers, is in itself so improbable, that it is not likely their Accusers will Charge them with it. Certainly none should do so without evidence.

When the Oppositor was so general, could any thing be more evidently requisite for diminishing it than a Delay; that Gentlemen of such Interest, as it is well known several of the Callers of the Presentee are, might have Time to exert it, for lessening the Opposition and encreasing the Appearance for the Candidate? And did not the Event shew that this was indeed the Effect of the Delay? If it be objected that this was not the Intention of it: Is it at all candid sometimes to speak of the promoting the Opposition as the *Effect* of the Delay: Sometimes as only the *Intention* of it, but that the *Effect* was the direct contrary?

As to the Presbytery's Intentions and the Reasons of their Conduct, they observe in their Answers to the

the

the Reasons of Appeal to the Assembly that, " Find-
 " ing the Parish in no Disposition to call the Presen-
 " tee; and having never moderated a Call in such cir-
 " cumstances; they thought it the safest and best
 " course to delay the Affair for some Time: and get
 " the Synod's Authority interposed, rather than con-
 " clude the Affair with an hasty Moderation."

It is said to have been one of the chief publick Pleadings against the Presbytery: that it was the Language of their Conduct, that let the University do what they pleased to promote the Settlement they were resolved to oppose it. If the meaning is, that tho' the University should use never so many Endeavours to get a good Concurrence; and whatever success they might have in such Endeavours, the Presbytery would oppose the Settlement: They have cause to complain of this as a very injurious Aspersion. And indeed it is a very strange Interpretation of what was the Presbyterys Conduct in this matter. viz. Their making the Candidate one of their Probationers: Their sending him so frequently to preach at *Govan*. Their sending no other Probationer there after he was presented: Their restricting the Trial of Inclinations to him besides the various Recommendations of him above mentioned.

If the meaning of the Objection was, That whatever the University did on their Part, if such Opposition, almost universal, continued on the Part of the Congregation; this would appear to the Presbytery a just Objection against the Settlement: This indeed is no Reflection on the Presbytery: But for that very reason it is difficult to suppose it to be the meaning of a Speech, the obvious and professed scope of which was to make their Conduct and Resolutions appear highly unjustifiable.

That

That so great Opposition would be a good Objection against a Settlement, is no more than the Language of our Acts of Assembly against violent Settlements: the Language of the constant Practice of moderating Calls: and indeed the Language of the Conduct of the Presbytery of *Glasgow*, as was hinted above, since the restoring of our Church Government.

But to proceed to what passed at the Moderation and judging of the Call in *Aprile 1746*.

Tho' the Memorial printed for the Univerfity, calls the Committee that moderated the Call the Presbytery's Committee, and accordingly charges them with Partiality; they were indeed not named by the Presbytery, tho' Members of it, but by the Synod; as their own Minutes bear. The Committee being thus named, and consisting of Ministers who were known to be very friendly to the Candidate, and had recommended him as they had Access; this itself is a Presumption that they would not be partial against him: And to candid People it must appear a Presumption in Favours even of the Presbytery; that there was not one step made by that Committee but what was approved of by them.

The same Memorial counts four Heritors Voters for the Presentee who, it says, were rejected without any just reason. It makes The W. C. Minor one of the Four: But Minor the real fact was that he was not rejected at all. For this the Subscriptions to the Call are appealed to.

Mean time this Minor stands for two Voters in the Calculations in the Memorial: In Article 1st among the Voters at the Moderation: and in Article

article

tic
M
be
Ca
ob
diff
of
Re
"
"
"
"
"
"
"
"
the
tw
ing
bein
"
"
"
"
ded
"
"
"
"
"
"
"
"
"
aga

ticle 4th among those unjustly rejected, but by the Memorial, restored to their right: This, it must be owned is very profitable Arthimetick for the Cause pled in the Memorial: mean time it may be observed from it, that, at this Rate it will be no difficult matter to make large enough Calls.

Other two of the four were presumptive Heirs of Heritors. On this head, in the Answers to the Reasons of Appeal to the Assembly, it is observed " The Presbytery knows of no Title that eldest Sons or presumptives Heirs, have to Vote as Heritors in the Call of a Minister: Besides, if this Title had been sustained, the Heritors in the Opposition insisted for a vote to their Sons, which could not have been refused: whereby a considerable strength would have been added to the Opponents Interest."

As to the Fourth said to be unjustly rejected, the Minutes of Moderation bear that he, with the two presumptive Heirs just now mentioned, being objected against as not being Heritors: and being therefore called on to produce their Rights; " the Answer was, that as they were allowed to Vote formerly, they did not apprehend any necessity of producing their Right at this Time." It is added in the Minutes. " The Committee are of Opinion that as to M. M. and R. and J. G. standing on the Roll at the founding, is no Evidence of their being Heritors, because no person was then obliged to object against them; but now being objected that they are not Heritors, and declining and not instructing their right; the Committee do not sustain their Votes."

There were Five Heritors voters for the Presentee, against whose Votes Objections were made by

by the other Side; but the Objections were neither sustained by the Committee nor by the Presbytery: And the Objections against three of the Votes in the Opposition were sustained by both. It would be tedious to go through all particulars. But there are two which joined with other things help much to form a right Judgement, of the Memorial so oft mentioned.

One is, that it says that A. S. tho' engaged in the alleged Combination, was admitted to Vote in the Opposition by the Presbytery. But the Fact is, he did not appear at all at the Moderation, or claim a Vote on either Side, and as for the founding the Presbytery gave no Judgment on any particular Votes then claimed. However this is the most useful Heritor of any, to the cause of the Memorialist and his Employers; he makes a fine Handle against the Elders for an alleged Combination, of which they are altogether Innocent. He likewise gives rise to an Objection against the Presbytery, for not rejecting his Vote which he did not claim; and lastly, he becomes a good Voter for the Presentee, as he was one of the Sixteen who appeared on neither Side, and therefore according to the Memorial must be presumed to be for him. We leave it to our Opponents to reconcile these things, but hope the impartial World will be convinced, from this and other Facts, what methods have been used to blacken the Presbytery, and procure Votes to the Presentee's Call.

The other particular is that the Memorial says, "They likewise admitted as a Voter in the Opposition a Life-renter whose Proxy had been rejected by the Committee as informal. But we wish the Memorialist and his Informers, had shown

shown the same desire not to blind and deceive in this particular, that they profess to have had on another Occasion, when speaking of the *Gorbals* Fewars, for no Notice is here taken at all of what is very clear and full in the Minutes: viz. that the Proxy, when presented to the Committee wanted a Direction; or power to some particular Person to give it in; and that Defect was abundantly supplied when it was presented to the Presbytery.

A chief Plea for the Call is that the *Gorbals* Fewars Voting for it, ought to

The *Gorbals* Fewars have been sustained as Heritors.

On this Head, in the Answers to the Reasons of Appeal to the Assembly it is observed, " These Fewars are merely Fewars of Houses: they pay no Cess; at least per capita. And what Proportion may be paid for the Lands on which the Town is Built, is paid out of a Publick Fund belonging to the Community: That they never before claimed an Interest as Heritors; or are liable to any Publick Burden within the Parish as such: That the admitting them is contrary to the Practice of the Church so far as we know it, and would introduce a dangerous Precedent: besides the Fewars in *Gowan* and *Partick*, pled that if those of *Gorbals* were admitted, they also claimed Votes by which if they were sustained, we imagine the Appellants would be considerable Losers."

Besides all this; seeing only 15 *Gorbals* Fewars, even by the Account given in the Memorial declare for the Presentee; and the whole are said to be about 60, besides upwards of 24. Fewars

in *Govan* and *Partick* : and all besides the 15 or most of them according to credible Information from Persons of Probity are on the other Side. Had the Presbytery had that attachment, which they are charged with to the Opposition ; was it not obviously the proper Way to promote it, to sustain all the Fewars, at least those of *Gorbals*, as Heritors, supposing even no more Evidence than credible Information that they favoured the Opposition ? But indeed it is further Presumption of it, that those on the other Side did not get them to join them, notwithstanding of their well known Influence, and their Pains to encrease the Concurrence.

If those Fewars were sustained as Heritors, how little might the other Heritors have to say ? and seeing the Memorial Classes all other Neutral Heritors on the Presentee's Side, what hindred classing all Neutral Fewars the same Way ; if it was not Consciousness that claiming 15 Heritors of the Rank of Fewars was enough in all Reason.

The Memorial has an Article of 16 Heritors, presumed for the Presentee because they
 Of Neutral Voted on neither Side. As something
 Heritors, was said about such Heritors in the
 Reasons of Appeal to the Assembly ; in the Answers to them it is said, “ The Presbytery are
 “ informed from the Committee, That to the
 “ best of their Knowledge there were only Two
 “ Heritors present who did not Vote : That several
 “ indeed were Absent : But the Presbytery
 “ cannot allow the Appellants to claim them as
 “ theirs ; for it is notour that some of them
 “ are Seceders who will not own any Minister of
 “ *Govan*.-- Others as we are informed have been
 “ urged

“ urged to appear on that Side” (meaning that for the Presentee) “ but have declined it.”

There is good Information, on further inquiry, that of these neutral Heritors; five are Seceders; Two or Three others reside; and Eight or nine do not reside in the Parish; and that these last decline meddling because they think the Inhabitants of the Parish should chuse their own Minister: which is an Argument that at least they are not for a violent Settlement of the Presentee: supposing some of them might even otherwise have due regard for him. And indeed that they are not for the Settlement, at least in the present Situation of Things, is presumable from the Reason above applied to the neutral Fewars:

According to the Principles on which the Memorial seems to argue; one may be presumed to have the Majority of those called legal Electors for him, tho’ he have almost no votes for him; provided the Majority of the Heritors of the Parish are, either Seceders, or Non residing Heritors that chuse to be neutral; or is made up of these two Sorts. But whatever be said of others, Is it not strange that Seceders should be presumed to be for a Presentee, and even for a violent settlement of him; merely on account of not voting on either side; considering the Principles from which such neutrality flows;

Whereas the Presbytery is blamed for the Difference they make betwixt the Congregations of *Gorbals* and *Gowan*; In their Answers to the Reasons of Appeal to the Assembly, they vindicate themselves thus. “ The Presbytery own they make
“ such a Distinction; and that it appears to them of considerable weight in this Question, not

“ wholly to disregard the Gorbals ; but to shew
“ much less Regard to their Consent, than to the
“ Stated hearers of the Minister of *Govan*. The Ap-
“ pellants own the People have erected a House for
“ Divine worship at their own Charges . They also
“ maintain a Preacher who resides among them ;
“ who regularly preaches every Sabbath, and once a
“ Month on week Days ; who stately Catechizes
“ them ; visits their Families and Sick ; and in short
“ performs all the Parts of the Ministerial Office a-
“ mong them that a Probationer can do. --- --- As
“ to the Sacrament of Baptism they commonly ap-
“ ply to the Ministers of *Glasgow*, being only sepa-
“ rated from that City by the Bridge : whereas
“ they are two Miles from *Govan* : It is very true
“ the Minister of *Govan* must give his consent to the
“ Choice of a Preacher they make ; but it is as cer-
“ tain they nominate the Man : And the Minister
“ has no other Power in the matter *than that of gi-*
“ *ving his consent* --- They [viz. the Gorbals People]
“ are no more his hearers, nay perhaps less than ma-
“ ny who live in other Parishes.

Of Gorbals Congregation none are nearer *Govan* Church than two Miles ; and some are three. On the other hand severals of *Govan* Division live nearer the Gorbals Church, some of them much nearer and have Seats there, which helps to clear a general remark to be verified afterwards, that not above two of all the stated Hearers in *Govan*-Church have given proper evidence that they are for the Candidate. By the stated Hearers are meant those who reside and are hearers in that Congregation, not only in the Summer season but through the Year.

In the Narrative of the Presbytery's Sentence *April* 24. There is the following clear Account of the Numbers on each side. “ The Presbytery find that
“ there

" there were 19 Heritors who voted for Mr. *Thom*
 " six of whom only reside in the Parish ; and against
 " him 35 Heritors, 23 of whom do reside : also
 " that seven Elders voted against Mr. *Thom*, tho'
 " one of them now declared by a Paper under his
 " Hand, that if the Church should ordain Mr. *Thom*
 " he should submit to his Ministry."

" They found also that 4 Heads of Families signed
 " the Call at the Moderation, and that by writs pro-
 " duced this Day, 30 declared their Concurrence with
 " it, and 27 promised Submission to Mr. *Thom's* Mi-
 " nistry should he be settled. They find likewise de-
 " clared and not contradicted by any, that three of
 " the Papers of Concurrence this Day produced, con-
 " taining the Subscriptions of 48 heads of Fami-
 " lies, were Subscriptions of Residenters in *Gorbals*
 " and Members of that Congregation."

" All these Things being duly considered by the
 " Presbytery and that the Parish of *Govan* consists of
 " about 400 examinable Persons, abstract from the
 " *Gorbals* and including *Gorbals* of above 3000, &c.

Thus it appears that of those called legal Electors
 tho' they were for the Candidate 19 in all, 6 of them
 residing : this made not one third of the whole of such
 Electors, nor above one fifth Part of the residing ones.

Of the Six called Residing Heritors, one half re-
 side in *Glasgow* in Winter ; of the other half one
 who lives at *Denfield* very near *Renfrew* (which is
 two Miles from *Govan*) is a hearer at *Renfrew*: Another
 who resides three Miles from *Govan* Church is
 a hearer in *Gorbals*: A third is reckoned not of our
 Communion, of which he gave this evidence a little
 before the Trial of Inclinations, That he had a Child
 Baptized by an Episcopal Minister ; so that none of
 the Six are stated hearers in *Govan*.

That this, which is of publick Notority, is not taken
 notice

notice of in the Presbyteries minutes, is an evidence that they have not been so keen as they are represented against their Accusers, seeing they have passed over in silence a Thing so much tending to shew the weakness of their Cause.

At the Trial of Inclinations, the residing Heritors who appeared for the Candidate, were the same Six now mentioned who are not stated hearers: no Elder appeared on that side at all. The only head of Family who appeared, tho' residing indeed in *Govan* Congregation, is not a stated hearer there but in *Gorbals*, living nearer to it. This verifies the above Remark, the Proof of which it was proper to refer to this Place, that at the previous *Trial in Nov.* among all the *Stated Hearers* in *Govan* through the Year not so much as one, either Heritor, Elder or head of Family appeared for the Candidate. Is it likely that to encrease such an opposition as this, was the End of the Presbytery's Delay and References.

What is hinted by the Memorialist about one of the above six Heritors, as having a Family in *Govan* even in Winter when himself resides in *Glasgow*; and what some say of another of them as spending more than the summer half Year in *Govan* is not material. It is enough to mention it.

The silence of the Memorialist tho' so attentive to whatever might favour his Cause, as to landed Interest and superior Valuation, is a Presumption that the Advantage in that respect is not on his side: that indeed it is considerably on the other side, is shewn in a full Account of that Matter, sent to *Edinburgh* last *May*, but too long to be here transcribed; and from which it appears that the Town of *Glasgow* are the chief Heritors of that Parish.

When a Gentleman of the Memorialists Character argues from the Rank of those on his side, perhaps he would

would
Town
ject
their
as w
in th
TI
not
all P
lent o
well
Settle
able
(whic
on in
a Cal
at the
It
disting
not f
from
whic
them
better
In
a diff
of the
Settle
" de
" he
" tal
seque
he w
Presb
so on
thing

would have vouchsafed some deference to the second Town in *Scotland*, but that he was instructed to object that their Vote was invalid, on pretence that their Commission was informal, tho' really as formal as what they give in other Cases: And tho' their Sense in that Matter was abundantly instructed.

Their appearing against this settlement, which was not till *April*, after it had been long notour that in all Probability it could be no other than a very violent one, strongly confirms what is indeed otherwise well known, that the bad consequences of such a Settlement of that Parish, must be the more considerable because of its vicinity to that populous City (which by the by is the best affected to our constitution in *Britain*) to whom it will be the next Thing to a Calamity of that sort among themselves to see it just at their Gates.

It was acting much in Character for a City of so distinguished zeal for Liberty, to interpose as they did; not from disregard to the other side; far from it: but from laudable Compassion to a populous Parish; in which they have so much Interest: and lying so near them, that they must know its Circumstances much better than Non-residing Heritors at a distance.

In the above cited *Answers*, the Presbytery taking a different Way from the Memorial speak with regard of the Heritors on both sides: and as to those for the Settlement they say "One of their voters in particular deserves the Esteem & Regard of this Church: But he has not his residence in that Place. And we charitably hope, did that worthy Gentleman view the consequence of this Settlement in the same Light we do, he would yet give over struggling for it. Possibly the Presbytery may own the same Thing as to others also on that side, whose laudable Application to other things may make them less acquainted with Matters of
fact

fact and experience as to Settlements: Is it not some Presumption of this, that in the first Reason of their last Appeal they speak, as if it were evident to them, that violent Settlements if once made, must be soon and cheerfully submitted to by the Majority ?

As to the Elders in the whole Parish ; there are 8 in all, 4 in each Congregation ; The Presb. Minutes show that 7 voted against the Presentee. The only one absent resides in Gorbals. The Memorial only mentions him as Silent, and infers that therefore he must in Law be presumed not unfavourable to the Presentee. But not only had he Signed the Petition in *November* for another Candidate, but also, about the Time of the Moderation, he declared before *Haughead* and *Bellehoustoun* both Heritors and Elders, that he would have sent a Proxy to the Moderation against the Presentee, were it not that he was so indisposed that he could not write.

The Elder in whose Name was given in a written Promise of Submission to the Candidates Ministry if Settled, afterwards Signed a Denial of any such Promise, in a Writ under his Hand, dated at *Glasgow, May 13. 1747.* and attested by two well known Witnesses, *John Hamilton Junior Maltman,* and *Peter Paterfon Writer.*

In that Paper he and other two who sign along with him (one of whom is an Heritor) all three Signers of the same alleged written Promise of Submission expressly say, That they declared they would go and hear Mr. *Thom* preach one Day without Prejudice in case he was Settled: That they were told, that the Paper which they had signed imported no more; that it would not be *made use* of at the Moderation: and they say likewise that *that Paper* was Signed some Days before the Moderation. yet the Memorial, the writer of which indeed might know no other, says that

tha
alre
mi
wa
in l
I
O
allec
legal
bina
cert
and
the
is f
" th
" th
" H
" xy
" co
" de
" hac
" on
" fai
" Ap
" fro
" ju
To
which
from
The
the a
about
fr. It
withou
withou
should

that it was *since* the Moderation, and the next Day after it, that that Elder signified his willingness to submit, &c. This written Denial of the alleged promise was sent to *Edinburgb*; but forgot by the Advocate in his Pleading.

In speaking of the Elders in general the Memorialist says, that what prevented any of that Body from joining the Candidate was an alleged illegal Combination *early Concert* against him. Speaking of this in *different Places*, he calls it a *Concert* or Combination that was early, Unwarrantable, and Illegal. He makes it an Objection against the Vote of S. R. In the Presbytery's Answers; it is said on this Head, "The Presbytery can scarce think the Appellants are in earnest in censuring them for sustaining the Vote of S. R. of H. Heritor and Elder: The Signed Letter of Proxy referred to by the Appellants was read and considered; and from it there appeared no Evidence of any illegal Combination. And tho' there had been any such thing, there was no Expression in the Letter that could import that the said Mr. *Rosuan* had any Concern in it. The Appellants if they please may produce the Proxy from which the Presbytery's *Interlocutor* will be justified."

To explain this Matter a little, the Proxy from which the Combination is inferred was a Proxy from A. S. produced at the Trial of Inclinations. The only Concert it related to was that about the above Petition for another Candidate; and about a fit Person to draw it up and Prosecute it. It is obvious such things cannot be done without some Concert, nor commonly perhaps without some Charges of which different Persons should bear a share.

D

Why

Why is not the alleged Combination inferred from that Petition itself rather than from a Proxy, relating to it? Is it that this would shew it was not *early* as it is expressly called; for the Petition was not presented till *Nov. 5.*

Why is it represented as having powerful Effects? when it had so little Effect on the only Man from whose Letter it is inferred, that at the Moderation he was neutral.

Why is it called a Combination among Elders, preventing that Body from joining in the Call? since the Writer of that Letter is not an Elder but an Heritor only; the very same above mentioned as of distinguished Usefulness to that Side who object against his Vote.

Is it Illegal and Unwarrantable for publick spirited Men, when they see a Parish threatened with a very violent Settlement, to concert how to get a comfortable one: and for that End to join in giving Church Courts true Information of the Peoples Inclinations? Indeed it is not the Petition that seems to be called the illegal Combination; otherwise it would have been made an Objection against all that great Number of Heritors, as well as all the Elders who signed the Petition. Whereas it is only against the Votes of two Men S. R. and A. S. that the Objection from the Combination is made.

Since the Petition neither is nor can be called an illegal Combination, much less can any thing else objected against in the Memorial be liable to that Imputation.

If at any Time elsewhere; Persons of some Influence combine, as it were blindly, against one whom they know little or nothing about, and who for what they know is not only well qualified, but may be acceptable and settled peaceably if the People are
let

let a
Wh
fo v
T
this
ed an
haps
chief
for t
atten
obtai
espec
ing o
O
Call,
being
As
some
Num
lived
Two
aThi
remai
Won
above
mise.
Paper
remai
even
Gorb
is mu
van
other
Nine
It
is ma

let alone, this is not at all parallel to this Case: Where a previous general strong Disinclination was so well known.

There was the more need for insisting thus on this Head; that it is one of the things first advanced and most insisted on by the Memorialists, as perhaps Allegations of the same kind are among the chief Stratagems, and Common Place in Pleadings for the like Causes. But it is a pity that it is not more attended to, that, however they may contribute to the obtaining of Decisions; they have no great tendency, especially when managed as in this Case, to the softening of Opposition.

Of the Four Heads of Families, who signed the Call, one belonged to the Gorbals, the other Three being near that Place are stated Hearers there.

As to the Nine of Govan Congregation signing some of the other Five Papers, the Four who signed Number 1st of them, when they lived in the Parish, lived at *Denfield* near *Renfrew*, and were Hearers there. Two of them are already removed out of the Parish; a Third is to remove at this Martimass: And then there remains but one of the four and that too but a single Woman. Of the five signing number 4th. three are those above mentioned who deny by a writ the alleged Promise. *So of the whole Nine who signed these separate Papers; and of the other four signing the Call, there remain, only two Men stated Hearers in Govan; and even one of these two W. S. in Shiels, much nearer Gorbals than Govan; has a Seat in the Gorbals and is much oftner a Hearer there. Of all those of Govan Congregation who signed either the Call or other Papers; after Martimass there will be only Nine; and one single Woman in the Parish.*

It was observed above, how justly a Difference is made betwixt the Congregations of *Govan* and

Gorbals. But even as to this last, how far is the Concurrence from being considerable? It amounts only to this, that among about 1800. examinable persons, or among about 500. Heads of Families, only 48 concur or promise Submission.

This cannot import a Submitting to leave their own *Gorbals Church*, which they help to support and to travel two or three miles farther unnecessarily. Nor can it import, that they would have the next Minister of the Parish, to submit to that Care of them which his Predecessor was so long free of. But only that they submit to his taking that Care of their Neighbours in the other Congregation; whether themselves submit to it or not.

Various Objections against the Five Papers of concurrence, advanced by the Procurator for the other Side and not refuted, are recorded in the Minutes: Such as marking one as Parishioner who really was not so: Want of Dates, and want of proper Attestations, one signer was openly detected to have been also a signer of the Call, thus claiming two Votes, all which joined to the above-attested Denial of the alleged Promise, shews how much Reason there is not to lay very great stress on those Subscriptions, tho their Number were more considerable than it is.

3. After the Assembly, much regard was shewn to their Authority in the particular *Decission* in this Case, as well as to the *same Authority in general Rules* against Violent Settlements; particularly the Act 1746. 30 requiring Pains to obtain Harmony, which certainly sometimes must require Delay. Much Time was bestowed and much Pains taken in repeated travelling with that People for that End, at a Season when Ministers are known to have a good deal to do (viz. at Communion in Summer) and this not only by those

those formerly intimately acquainted with the Candidate, but others; a good Part of the Presbytery engaging in that Work: Meetings with that People being kept, partly in a more publick, partly in a more private way: and due Care taken that People in different Corners might be timely warned to the meetings; which were mostly in the Church and Populous Village of *Govan*. But at last the Committee subdivided: That they might travell with the People in different Parts on both Sides of *Clyde*.

In *August* the Committee had some hopes of Success, which caused no small Concern when an Appeal was then made on account of *Delay's*. This was expressed with such Earnestness that they who made the Appeal, by a Laudable Condescension on their Part, at that Time withdrew it.

But after the former travelling was resumed; there appeared less Ground to hope for Success than before, so that in the *Interlocutor* Appealed from in *September*, the Appointment of further travelling was only conditional, in Case of *Hopes* of Success.

The greatness of the Difficulty in the Way of proceeding further at present, appears from the more than ordinary evidence that this Settlement, if made while the Opposition lasts, will not be submitted to, and the consequences with which this must be attended.

4. As to the *First*, seeing it is certainly safest arguing from experience on this head; how many Proofs does it afford of the Inflexibility of opposition in such Cases; as in *Bathgate* and *Inshennan* formerly, and more lately in *Muckhart*, *Balsron*, *Killmaurs* and other Places, in some of which it has Subsisted 14 or 15 Years or more. And if there are Instances of a
contrary

contrary Nature, it does not appear they are in the Bounds of the Synod where *Govan* lies, tho' these Bounds make about an 8th Part of this Church.

If there are such Instances any where else, Is it not presumeable, they are too few to venture on safely? And if in some rare Instances opposition has given way at last, after subsisting a long Time, should it not be minded how much Religion must have Suffered during that Time?

Such Instances will not be parallel to *Govan*, if there are any such Disparities as these following 1. If they happned long ago before there were such Hot Contests about Settlements; or about Opinions reckoned to be Presbyterian Principles on that Head: or 2. In any remoter Corners where there is not so great a general Attachment to Principles of that Character, joined with laudable zeal for our Constitution in Church and State, or 3. If they are only Instances of a Minority yielding to a Majority, either of Legal Callers, or of the Congregation; Yea if they are not Instances where the Opposition has been almost Universal, especially among the Stated Hearers; and that in a populous Congregation standing out against the repeated Sollicitations of Gentlemen of Influence; and the laborious travelling of their own Presbytery: and not founded on mere want of Acquaintance with the Candidate, but appearing and subsisting after knowing him long: The mentioning of which ought by no means to be understood as the least Insinuation against a Character so well attested, and which even the Opposers have not attacked, but only, as it is intended, as a Confirmation of the Inflexibleness humanely speaking, of the Disinclination to him.

Other Disparities might be added relating to Things tending to irritate the People, such as Misinformations either about the Reality of the Opposition, or the Cause

Ca
be
on
by
an
bo
kn
ne
tre
to

an
It
fiv
dee
ly
an
did
-ha
still
of t
riet
Ob
sion
sepe
E
of t
cep
wh
and
Par
pro
are
Gov
are
tion

Cause of it, as when sometimes the reality of it has been, seemingly at least, denied, that it might appear only or chiefly an opposition on the Part of the Presbytery; or when the Reality of it has been owned and imputed to the Presbytery or Elders as the Cause; both which the People well know, and others might know not to be fact: or when the Reality and Earliness of it may have been even publickly owned, but treated in a manner tending rather to exasperate than to soften.

There is yet another distinguishing Evidence against any tolerable Probability of Submission in this Case, It arises from the Diversity of the Declarations in the five *above Papers* separate from the Call: Some indeed are *Declarations* of Concurrence; but others only of an Intention to submit; and that joined with an Intimation that if they were at Liberty, the Candidate might not be their Choice. Tho' a Majority had made Declarations of *this last kind*, would it not still be a *Settlement* against the Inclinations or Choice of the People? Let it be observed then, that contrariety to all their Inclinations is by no means the *only* Objection; but contrariety to all *probability of Submission*; excepting the Signers of the Call, and of those separate Papers.

But who are those and how many are they? All of them Stated Hearers elsewhere than in *Govan*, excepting two at most; excluding the above three, who by an attested Writ, deny the alleged Promise, and cannot therefore be counted on. The greater Part by far are *Gorballs* People, as is observed above; promising to submit to a Minister *whose* Ministrations are not to be attended on by them, Some are of *Govan* Congregation, but so near to *Gorballs* that they are hearers there. Of the Nine of *Govan* Congregation Signing some of the five Papers, Three deny the promise

Promise : Three have left the Parish including one who removes at this Term of Martinmas. The 7th living at *Denfield* is a hearer at *Rensfrow* : And but a single Woman. Remain only two stated Hearers at *Govan*, and even one of them is credibly said to hear mostly in *Gorbals*. But suppose it otherwise, can the Submission of these two be called the Submission of a tolerable Congregation. ?

The native Consequences of making this Settlement during this Opposition, will be obvious to such as are acquainted with the many Evils that attend violent Settlements in general ; especially those that are more remarkably so. It would be tedious to enumerate them. Not only such Settlements do not answer their End which is Edification, but they are the Occasions of many Things contrary to that good End : and that sometimes for a Course of Years. Even the more pious Sort, are exposed to various Snares ; and the more Irreligious, in Danger of growing worse and worse, by throwing themselves from under all regular Inspection : Ignorance, Animosities, Contempt of Ordinances, Clamour and Indignation against Church Judicatories abound, with various other Evils. Even the better sort of such as have brought about such Settlements, & who are not intirely insensible & unconcerned about things that hurt religion can have little pleasure in observing the lasting calamities of that kind, in which they have had an active Hand ; and which it is not in their Power to help. Others who may fortifie themselves against such Considerations relating to the publick Interest of Religion, cannot well avoid uneasiness from private Friendship to the Candidate to whom they pretended Kindness. Tho' they may at first Triumph in their Success against the Parishes over whom they have shewn their Power, as if it was a Victory over Enemies ; It can give them little Pleasure to see a Minister for whom

they
Circu
had
migh
more
The
valua
great
Th
Cour
near ;
to hu
Grou
and h
count
stabil
Succes
to the
some
this Ch
tend to
It is
have
Gener
Stop to
rebuke
ago
for for
As
are cal
stances
this if
too
rities
Larger
not bei
the cen

they have Friendship, fixed in so uncomfortable Circumstances, especially when they reflect how if it had not been for their ill judged Friendship, he might one time or other have proved as useful, or more so, and lived as comfortably as many others. The more the Qualifications of such a Minister are valuable, the greater pity it is that they are in so great a Measure lost as to publick Usefulness.

The Discontent and Dissaffection to our Church Courts, caused by such Settlements, Spreads far and near; So that the multiplying of them must tend to hurt our Constitution, by weakening a chief Ground on which the Legislative has Established, and hitherto through the Goodness of Providence countenanced it, as subservient to our happy civil Establishment, and to the Interests of the Protestant Succession and Civil Liberty: But its Subservience to these goods Ends, depend on the Preservation of some Union between the Ministers and the People in this Church, which Union violent Settlements plainly tend to dissolve.

It is no doubt on Account of such bad Effects, as have been hinted of that Sort of Settlements, that General Assemblies have taken such Pains to put a Stop to them, made such Acts against them, so oft rebuked those who made them, and not very long ago reversed one of them after it had Subsisted for some time.

As the Effects of violent Settlements in general are calamitous; they are eminently so in some Instances beyond others: That they will prove so in this if made in the present Circumstances, may be too justly apprehended from several Disparities above hinted, and among the rest from the Largeness of the Parish: And from its Situation, not being in a remote obscure Corner; but near the center of a Populous, and hitherto mighty well

affected Country; where it may raise a ferment not easy to be conceived. Nor can this Objection be refuted by Supercilious disdain of all Regard to the Clamors of the People, unless it can be proved that Men should disdain all Regard to the Edification of the People, and the preventing the Obstacles of it.

The prolonging of Vacancies is far from being desirable, Love to Ordinances must make pious People-averse from it, yet the Things mentioned seem plainly to shew that prolonging of Vacancies for some Time is by no means so hurtful to the interests of Religion as violent Settlements, especially those that are so in a higher Degree. This may be more strongly affirmed of Corners where there are many Churches not far from one another, and where a Vacancy may be oft supplied by a Presb. especially of any Parish where there is as here, one Preacher who is and must be the Peoples Choice. And Experience has shewn the Advantage of prolonging a Vacancy to try what might be done; through the goodness of Providence, to avoid a violent Settlement, there being more expedients than one by which such things may be avoided; and that, as was hinted above, without prejudice to the Authority that has made decisions in favours of them.

Page 6. Line 26. for 1745, reads 1746.

Extract of a MINUTE of the
Presbytery of GLASGOW.

AT *Glasgow*, the sixth Day of *November*, One thousand Seven hundred and Forty Seven Years. The Presbytery of *Glasgow*, having met this Day according to their Adjournment of the fourth Instant. They resumed the Consideration of the Manuscript which had then been read before them,
Inttled

Intituled a Memorial concerning the Conduct of the Presb. of *Glasgow*, as to the Settlement of *Govan*, and having considered the Extracts therein contained, and the References made to their Records, and the following Papers, viz. Their Answers to the Reasons of Appeal from them to the Assembly, the Call to the Presentee to *Govan*, and the Five Papers of Concurrence with it; The Presb. find the said Extracts and References genuine and true. And particularly having before them, the said Call, they find that One Heritor, of whom the University's printed Memorial, says, that his Vote for the Call was refused by the Presb. is really a signer of it by Proxy; and having also before them, the five Papers of Concurrence with the Call, they attest the Truth of all that the Memorial says concerning them, which is not in the Records, particularly that a signer of one of these Papers, had also signed the Call, which was detected in open Presb. *April 24.* and his Subscription cancelled, and as to an Elder and Two other Persons who had signed another of these Papers, promising Submission to the Candidates Ministry should he be ordained, the Presb. declare they had before them a Paper signed by the said Three Persons before witnesses, one of them a Notar-publick which fully justifies what the Memorial says Concerning them, the Presb. also attest, That it was of publick notoriety, that the Parish was disinclined to the Candidate previously to the Affair being before the Presb. and that after he was presented, few of the People of the Parish heard him. And lastly the Presb. declare, that so far as they know there is nothing Contained in the said Memorial but what is agreeable to Truth. And the Presb. considering how much their Character has suffered by Injurious Aspersions cast upon their Conduct, and Refuted by
the

the said Memorial, do heartily agree that the same be published. And whereas there was shewen this Day to the Presb. a Paper signed by all the Elders that reside in *Govan* Congregation as Distinguished from *Gorbals*, and by Five Heritors, Dated *November 6.* Containing a Representation of the present State of that Parish, as to the Opposition to the proposed Settlement, with several Facts of some Importance relative thereto, the Presb. having heard the said Paper read, judged that it contained Confirmations of several Things in their Answers to the Reasons of Appeal to the Commission, and of several Facts proper to be attested in the above Memorial, Concerning their Conduct. And therefore recommend to the Compilers of the said Memorial, to publish that Paper along with it, together with this minute of Pres. and for that purpose an Extract of it. Extracted from the Minutes of the proceedings of the said Presb. on this and the preceeding Page. By

JOHN ROBERTSON. Presbytery, Clk.

We *John Picken* of *Febrocks*, *Stephen Rowand* Portioner of west End of *Meikle Govan*, § *John Rowand* of *Teucherhill*, *Robert Baird* Portioner of East End of *Meikle Govan*, *John Robison* of *Hillock* Heritors, *Stephen Rowand* of *Haughead* Heritor and Elder, *James Rowand* of *Bellyhouston* Heritor and Elder, *John Purden* Portioner in *Partick* Heritor and Elder, and *John Bigger* Elder; all of, and within the Parish of *Govan*, and of *Govan* Division and constant Hearers at the Kirk of *Govan*. Considering of how great importance it is to the Paroch, That the very Reverend Commission of the General Assembly of the Church of *Scotland*, had a true and well attested Account of the Facts relating to the present State of the opposition to Mr. *William Thom* Present-
§ *Robert Rowan* of *Broomloan* tee

tee, his being Minister of the said Paroch, which has been and is still misrepresented by some: We hereby Declare, That whereas the said Presentee was employed frequently to Preach by our late Minister the last six or seven Years of his Life, the Minister being ill, & the Presentee being nearly related to a Neighbour who was Paroch Schoolmaster and Precentor during all that Time. It was well known that there was a great and General Disinclination in the Body of the People, to the hearing of him Preach; Farther a few Weeks or Days after the Ministers Death, when Sir *John Maxwell* told an Heritor of the Paroch, he had thought of Proposing Mr. *Thom*, that Heritor begged he would not do it, and told him he was sure Mr. *Thom* would be very disagreeable to the Paroch: That upon this the said Sir *John Maxwell* said, He would come to *Govan* and meet with some Heritors and Elders about that matter. That accordingly some time after, he did this, and making the same proposals of Mr *Thom*; in this meeting, was again further assured by all present, how disagreeable it would be to the Paroch, That hereupon the said Sir *John Maxwell* desired the Members of this Meeting to make a further Trial of the Inclination of the People, as to Mr. *Thom*, That this was gone into, and the Trial accordingly made; and report made to said Sir *John Maxwell* at an after Meeting with the same Persons, That the Paroch were found to be of the same Sentiments, as to Mr. *Thom* they had formerly told him of. That at this last Meeting; the said Sir *John Maxwell* asking what Person the Paroch would be pleased with to supply the Vacancy *Heathery-Hall* answered, That either of the late Minister's two Assistants, viz. Mr. *Anderfen* at *Gotballs* or Mr. *Dennystone* who had been at *Govan*, would be very agreeable to the People

ple. And whereas the University's Printed Memorial says, That they have made to the Paroch an offer of a Leet of two, no return was made to this offer: We attest that the offer was publickly Considered at a numerous Meeting of Heritors residing and not residing, and Elders in the Church of *Govan*, which Meeting had been Warned by all the same formalities, as in the Case of moderating a Call. That after long reasoning, it was put to the Vote, accept of the Leete or not, and it was carried by a great Majority in the negative. That the Rector of the University being present, and it being certain that he would Report the Determination; It was not thought very necessary to send a formal message to the University, acquainting them of it. That if in this there was the neglect of a formality, it was occasioned by these who were keen for the Leete, their going off in a hurry, which made the Meeting break up abruptly.

We further attest, when a delay was agreed on by both Sides till after Harvest, 1746. And a Trial whether the People could be brought in during this interval, It was after Harvest reported to the University by four who are both Heritors and Elders, That the disinclination to Mr. *Thom* in the Paroch, far from being abated, seemed rather to be growing Stronger. And we hereby declare, that the Opposition is as great now as when the Call was judged of by the Pres. if not greater: And that whereas an Account of the opposition as it then appeared to the Pres. and is narrated in their minutes, would give some Light; In order therefore to give a more full Account of this Affair, We attest the following particulars,

Whereas in the Minutes of the Presb. the residing Heritors for the Presentee are reckoned six in Number, the one half of these Reside at *Glasgow* in the

the Winter Season; and of the other three, one is a hearer in *Gorballs*, and the other at *Renfrew* living very near it; And the third has given clear Evidence of being of another Communion.

2. As to Elders, whereas there are but 8 in all, seven Voted against the Presentee at the moderation, the only one absent, who lives in *Gorballs*, not only had formerly signed a Petition for another Candidate, But also declared before two of our Members, viz.. *Haughead* and *Bellybouston*, that he would have sent a Proxie against the Presentee at the moderation, if he had not been so indisposed that he could not Write.

3. As to heads of Families, we can make good the following general and important Remark, That as there is no Heritor, or Elder, so there are not above two heads of Family, that can be reckoned Stated hearers in *Govan* Congregation, among all the signers either of the Call, or of the five separate Papers afterwards given in: which Remark we make out thus, As these who signed the Call were only four in Number, one lives in *Gorballs*, the other three living nearest to the Church there are Stated hearers there: of the nine of *Govan* Division who sign some of the separate Papers, four of the said signers of said Papers lived at *Denfield* very near *Renfrew*, and so were hearers there: But beside this, two of them are removed out of the Paroch already, a third is to remove at *Martimafs* next, so that of the four only one remains who is a single Woman; of the other five Viz. these in 4to. three (one of whom is an Elder) are these Persons who by an attested writ has denied the Promise of Submission alledged on them, so that as was said of all the signers for the Presentee, there remains only two stated hearers in *Govan*, and even of these two *William Shiells* living
in

in *Shiells* is much nearer *Gorballs*, has a Seat there, and mostly hears there.

4. Whereas the Neutral Heritors were reckoned by the pleaders for the Presentee to be on his Side, We attest that five of these being Seceders who refuse that allegation, the rest except two are Non residing heritors, of whom we have credible Information that tho' they are averse from meddling, their declared Opinion is, that the Paroch should have Liberty to chuse their own Minister.

5. As it has been a chief Argument for the settlement, that the Presb. promoted the Opposition, we attest that this is not Fact; and that the Opposition is neither owing to any deed of Presb. nor any Expressions or private practice of the Members. And finally we attest that we could have got many more Persons able and willing to certify the premises had it seemed needful.

Govan, the 6th Day of *Nov.* 1747

Stephen Rowan, Elder.
John Bigger, Elder.
John Purdon, Elder.
James Rowan, Elder.

John Picken,
Stephen Rowan,
John Rowan,
Robert Baird
John Robertson.

I Notar-publick Subscribing, attest the Subscriptions of the hail above Named and designed Persons, on this and the Two following Pages, (except *John Biggars*,) I being Witness, to the hail.

Peter Paterfon,

F I N I S.

