

wealthy. She has not only within herself a power of recovery, but a superabundance the Honourable John Young's assertions as to the actual depth of the available channel.

Amongst other tenders for the mail contract was that of Messrs. Edmiston, Allan & Co., and theirs being considered the most satisfactory, it was accepted by the Canadian Government and a contract was entered into for the carrying of the English mails fortnightly from Montreal in summer, and from Portland, Maine, during the winter months to Liverpool, England.

A subsidy was agreed upon, which, we believe, was about half the amount now paid, and the Montreal Ocean Steamship Company was fairly started, much to the satisfaction of the people of Canada, who were satisfied that the mail contract was now in the hands of those who would do it justice. Nor have they ever had occasion to change the opinion they then formed. Difficulties, which were sufficient to daunt the courage of any but a most determined man, who did not know what the word fail meant, so far as he was personally concerned, were encountered during the earlier years of this memorable undertaking, but they were all manfully encountered, and overcome.

As the trade grew, Montreal became an entrepot of not only the goods imported by the Canada merchant, but also for those of the importer in the Western States; the magnificent water carriage offered by the canals, the River St. Lawrence and the chain of lakes, enabling our forwarders to compete successfully with their American cousins for a large and constantly increasing share of the carrying trade of the Far West. The benefits offered by our port for shipment of cereals and other products of the country were also quickly taken advantage of by the western cities, and the shipping trade of Montreal increased daily, and with it the number of the vessels employed and their tonnage as well. In a short time it was found necessary to secure a weekly mail service, and the firm of Edmiston, Allan & Co. then increased the number of their steamships, each new vessel placed on the line being superior in size, power and speed to the one immediately before her. It is not necessary to follow the fortunes of this line to the present day, it is sufficient to state that on the retirement of the late Mr. William Edmiston from the firm in 1864, Messrs. Hugh and Andrew Allan continued the business as H. & A. Allan, and the line of steamships were known then and since as the Allan Line. Montreal may well be proud of this line, which for careful management, magnificent ships, and speedy passages is not surpassed, if it be equalled by any other line in the world.

## THE TEMPORALITIES FUND OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH OF CANADA IN CONNECTION WITH THE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND.

### II.

The series of unhappy events which led to the formation of the Free Church in Scotland, arose from the setting up of the claim to Spiritual Independence, which differed in no respect from the claims of the Church of Rome, to decide that everything ecclesiastical was necessarily spiritual and that it was for the Church to decide in all cases. I can understand, though I cannot sympathise with, the claims of the Church of Rome. I can neither understand nor sympathise with the claims of the Free Church, which attempts to set up an ecclesiastical supremacy for itself, whilst denouncing in the most bitter and unmeasured terms the same assumptions on the part of another. This was the view taken by Sir James Graham in reference to the "Claim of Rights," which, he said, demanded that all the proceedings of the Church, whether legislative or judicial, should be beyond the cognizance of the courts of law, which should have no power to determine whether matters brought before them were within the scope of their authority, if, in the opinion of the Church, these matters involved any spiritual consideration, and that neither sentences of courts nor decrees of the House of Lords should be effectual if they interfered with the rights and privileges of the Church, of which interference, and of which spiritual considerations the Church itself was to be the exclusive judge. Earl, then Lord John, Russell, concurred in this view, as did other statesmen on both sides of politics. Sir Robert Peel said emphatically:—

"This House and the country never could lay it down, that if a dispute should arise in respect of the statute law of the land, such dispute should be referred to a tribunal not subject to an appeal to the House of Lords. If peace could be secured, if the rights of the subject could be maintained consistently with the demands of the Church, then, indeed, such is my opinion of the pressing evils of this protracted disputation, that I should almost be induced to make any concession to obtain tranquillity. But my belief is that such claims, were you to concede them, would be unlimited in their extent. . . . If the House of Commons is prepared to depart from those principles on which the Reformation was founded, and which principles are essential to the maintenance of the civil and religious liberties of the country, nothing but evil would result, the greatest evil of which would be the establishment of religious domination, which would alike endanger the religion of the country and the civil rights of man."

That patronage was the mere stalking horse used by the leaders of the party which ultimately became the Free Church, and that ecclesiastical supremacy under the name of Spiritual Independence, was the real object aimed at, is abundantly evident from the course followed since the abolition of patronage in Scotland, where an attempt has been made to draw together two ecclesiastical bodies holding the most opposite views, with the object of disendowing and disestablishing the Church of Scotland. That the members of the branch of the Church of Scotland in this country refuse to join with those whose sympathies and, before long, whose active efforts, will be added to those of their friends in the Mother Country, is simply a duty they owe to themselves and to the Church by which they have been fostered. As represented everywhere their objections are childish, arising from stupid obstinacy. But they are more than that. They are founded on reason and on justice, on the love of constitutional liberty, respect for the laws and determination to preserve the rights of conscience.

Lest I should be suspected of using the words of those who were opposed to the claims of the Free Church, I quote the following from one of the leading authorities of that body, the Rev. Dr. Kennedy, of Dingwall, in a lecture delivered last January. His claim to speak on behalf of that Church and his ability to do so must be fully recognised by all who have followed her history. The word *Erastianism* placed in antithesis to Papacy, did good service in its day, but

sensible men now laugh at the long pole, white sheet, scooped out turnip and candle end which frightened the ignorant. In the present case it means simply Constitutionalism. Dr. Kennedy says:

"As to spiritual independence I will only say that there can be no difficulty in proving the Free Church doctrine regarding it to be Scriptural. Christ is King of Zion. As such it is His to appoint the province, the organization, and the work of the Church. It is His, too, to issue laws for her guidance in the performance of her work, and, as He has done so, it is not allowable that the Church should conform her action to any other rule, or subject her will to any other authority. Her King is alive and He hath the seven spirits of God. He can, therefore, effectually regulate the action of the Church. The Church should not submit to any authority but Christ's in doing her proper work, and she requires no other guidance than that of His word and spirit in order that her work should be rightly done. She has to please Christ, and Christ alone; and she is to be guided by Christ, and Christ alone."

"Within the Establishment (the Church of Scotland) in Disruption times, and to a great extent still, the idea on this subject was that either of the powers—Church and State—must be superior if not supreme; that they cannot be co-ordinate, and that in order to a settling of arising differences, either must be entitled to decide, as being superior in authority to the other. So says popery, and it claims the superiority for the Church. So says Erastianism, and it claims the superiority for the State. The Free Church doctrine is that Church and State have co-ordinate jurisdictions, each with its distinct province, and its own peculiar work; that Christ is supreme over both; that it is His to decide all questions between them by the verdict of His word, and that in the event of a controversy arising as to the limits of their respective provinces, the State can only legitimately deal with the civil interests, supposed to be affected by the action of the Church, and may not attempt to reverse any ecclesiastical decision or to arrest any ecclesiastical process. In the United Presbyterian Church 'the Church's liberty' is the phrase substituted for the spiritual independence of the Church, and the right to liberty is made to rest on the unlawfulness of any alliance between the Church and State, it being held that the civil ruler, as such, has nothing to do with the Church or with religion, beyond allowing all Churches to do as they please, and all religions alike to be developed according to their several tendencies. There can be no demand for liberty on the ground of Christ having given a distinct power of governing in His Church, presented by a voluntary Church to the State, for she asks to share her liberty in common with Churches which can have no such ground to found their claim."

The connection between the Churches here and there in Scotland has been all along of a close and intimate nature. In 1844, the only organised body in Canada holding the Presbyterian form of Church government was the Presbyterian Church of Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland, the Synod of Upper Canada having a few years previously been merged into that Church. The ministers of the Synod of Upper Canada were almost exclusively ministers of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland, a body in entire conformity with the Church of Scotland. In 1843, the secessions in Scotland, known as the Disruption, took place, those who separated styling themselves modestly the *Free* Church of Scotland. Those who adhered to them in this country separated in like manner, and following the example of their brethren in Scotland called themselves the Presbyterian Church of Canada. In 1847, various minor bodies of Presbyterians in Scotland joined into the United Presbyterian Church, and the scattered congregations here which held the same views took the same name. There were then: 1. The Presbyterian Church of Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland, whose name sufficiently indicates the ecclesiastical views it held. 2. The Presbyterian Church of Canada, adhering to and holding the same views as the Free Church. 3. The United Presbyterians, adhering to and holding the same views as their brethren in Scotland. In 1864, the two latter bodies joined, under the name of the Canada Presbyterian Church. In 1875, a number of members of the Presbyterian Church of Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland joined the other body, under circumstances to be hereafter detailed, but the Synod itself continued in existence, although greatly weakened by the secession. Power was granted by the Local Legislatures to transfer to the new body the funds and properties of that Synod, which now seeks to be continued in its rights, and has resolved to test the constitutionality of the Acts of these Legislatures, in the suit now instituted by the Rev. Robert Dobie.

DOUGLAS BRYMNER.

## THE POPES.

(67.) SABINIEN, 604–605, was a Tuscan by birth, and had been Nuncio at Constantinople. It is recorded that in a time of famine in Rome he refused to give any assistance to the poor, saying that his predecessors had been too extravagant. He held office only for six months.

(68.) BONIFACE III., 606. After the death of Sabinien the Papal See was vacant for a year. A deacon of the Roman Church was at length elected. He had succeeded Sabinien as Nuncio at the Imperial Court; and the Emperor Phocas, being irritated by the conduct of the Patriarch of Constantinople, favoured Boniface's election and gave him permission to take the title of Universal Bishop. Boniface thereupon called a council at Rome, by which he was confirmed in his new title, to the exclusion of the Patriarch. His death occurred shortly afterwards.

(69.) BONIFACE IV., 607–614, a native of Valeria, was chosen after a lapse of ten months. He obtained as a gift from the Emperor the ancient temple called the Pantheon—built by Marcus Agrippa thirty years before the birth of Christ—and consecrated it as a Christian church. At a council held at Rome in the year 610, Mellitus, Bishop of London, was present, and certain regulations were enacted for the administration of the Church of England.

(70.) DEODATUS I., 614–617. The See of Rome was again vacant for several months after the death of Boniface. The son of a sub-deacon was finally chosen. Very little is known of the events that occurred during his term of office.

(71.) BONIFACE V., 617–625, was elected without delay. He received a letter from Justus, Archbishop of Canterbury, giving news of great progress of the Church in Britain. In reply the Pope congratulated him on the success of his labours, sending also presents to the King of Northumbria, Edwin by name, with a letter exhorting him to accept the Christian religion.

(72.) HONORIUS I., 626–638, received a letter in the year 627 from England announcing the conversion of King Edwin. About the same time, also, the inhabitants of the provinces of Norfolk and Suffolk embraced Christianity. Honorius seems to have taken great interest in the missions established in various parts of the British Isles. He made a strenuous effort to induce the Scottish churches to adopt the Roman usage in reference to the time of cele-