

the latter, to a certain extent, sympathizes with these views. In the Voluntary controversy it was endowment *ab extra*, or by the State, that was chiefly objected to; but Voluntarism, both at home and in the colonies, now objects to endowment *ab intra*, or by the Church itself. The difficulty would not then be removed by holding out to the Voluntaries that, in Canada, the endowment is not by the State, but from the resources of the Church itself; and no one within the Church would contemplate the idea of giving up the endowment as a condition of union. The endowment element constitutes an essential point of difference between the case of Canada and that of Australia, where the Presbyterian Churches have united. In the latter country the Church of Scotland stood, as to endowment, precisely on the same footing as the other Presbyterian bodies, and, consequently, no difficulty was felt on this ground.

Another reason arises from the circumstance, that the status of the ministers of the Church of Scotland is very different from that of the body with which it is proposed to unite. In the latter, no literary training at any academic institution is required previous to entering the Hall. It was found impossible to occupy the land without dispensing with this essential qualification, and, consequently, a large proportion of the ministers drawn from Canada are without any college training. In the Church of Scotland, on the other hand, a training equivalent to that at home is rigidly required. The students must pass through the arts curriculum at Queen's College before they can enter the Divinity Hall. This also forms an important point of difference between Canada and Australia. Though strongly tempted to relax in its requirements, the Church in Canada was resolved to keep up the status of the clergy, so that it should not sink beneath the requirements of the Church at home. It would be a great blow to the cause of religion in Canada if she did so. She is the only Church there that demands a high standard; all the other bodies, including the Church of England, dispense with a preliminary college education. No doubt, all the religious bodies would prefer such an education, but the Church of Scotland is the only one that requires it as a *sine qua non*.

Another reason for not entering into the projected union is that of politics. The Church of Scotland, as a whole, is strongly Conservative, while the other Presbyterian bodies are, as a whole, strongly Liberal. The latter almost universally belong to what is termed the *clear grit* party, which is of a very extreme character. This antagonism is at present strongly brought out on the university question, in which the Church of Scotland joins with the Church of England, while the united body of Presbyterians is violently opposed.

The last reason we shall specify is, that the

proposed union requires a severance of the Church of Scotland in Canada from the Church at home. This would be regarded by the warmest friends of the Church in Canada as an irreparable injury. It is the connection with the Mother Church that has led the Canadian Church to maintain her high position in Canada, by aiming at a high standard of education and a permanent endowment. This, too, is the secret of the successful career of the Church of England in Canada. The esteem in which that Church is held by her members is not due so much to the fact that she is an Episcopal Church as that she is the Church of England: for the Church at home and the Church in Canada are not merely connected, but ecclesiastically identical. It is true there is not so close a union in the case of the Church of Scotland and her branch in Canada. Still, in the case of a great many adherents of the latter, the bond of attachment is not that the Church polity is Presbyterian, but that the Church is the Church of their fathers, and an established Church of the empire. Were a fusion of the two bodies effected, so that the distinctive characters of the Church of Scotland were merged in those of the other party, it is highly probable that a large proportion of the more influential laity, and some of the clergy, would prefer joining the Church of England—just as many Scotchmen, in going to reside in England, prefer the ministrations of the Church of England to those of Dissenters, even though the Dissenting form be Presbyterian. Mere ecclesiastical polity is not always the strongest bond of union. Two Churches identical in polity may be so opposed in their aims and character that a real union is impossible.

The above considerations have apparently led the Synod of Canada to abandon all official action for the furtherance of the union; and certainly, at present, a mere amalgamation of the two Churches would be the very reverse of union. It would be only a mechanical uniformity with vital elements of discord.

Is, then, all hope of union to be abandoned? Is all discussion of the subject to be quashed as adverse to the welfare of the Church? By no means. The freer the discussion the sooner will the nature of the most desirable union be understood. The subject of Presbyterian union at home is freely discussed. Even the Moderator of the General Assembly ventured, in his closing address, to moot the subject, and he would not likely have done so unless it were regarded as an open question by the warmest friends of the Church. But it is important to consider the nature of the union that is always meant. When such proposals are made at home, no one ever dreams of disestablishing the Church of Scotland, so that she may stand on the same level with Dissent, and thus effect a harmonious union. Nothing more is meant than that a door should be opened by which