

over the earth when it was "wasteness and emptiness," and brought forth the beauty and loveliness of every subsequent age, is the same Divine Spirit which works in Christians both to will and to do of His good pleasure, which carries on the operations by which our sonship is completed and matured, and which creates and fosters the growth of those fruits which are inseparable from the Christian life.

The providence of God cannot confine itself to generalities either of temporal matters or spiritual. It must therefore be what is called a "particular providence," and must extend not only to the individual members of the Church, but also to the several actions, the various endowments, and the particular interpositions of the Christian vocation. A general providence which had no relation to individual instances and to single acts and requirements, would be no providence at all to the Christian. Such an idea would oppose itself to every principle on which the Church is constructed, would ignore the personal responsibility and the individual blessedness of the several faithful members of the Church, and might, if such a thing were possible, secure the honour of the Messiah, and the glory of the body He is engaged in organizing both in Heaven and earth, while it would leave the individual Christian to grope his way alone and unaided through the mazes of a howling wilderness, with no definite aid, no particular assistance in surmounting the difficulties of life, in maturing the graces belonging to our sonship, or in bringing forth the fruits of holiness with which the Kingdom of Heaven is to abound. But the one declaration of Christ, "the very hairs of your head are all numbered," conveys the blessed assurance that His providence ordereth all things in accordance with the regulations He has laid down for His government, and if it extends itself to the most trifling temporal concerns of the Christian man, it cannot possibly shut out those higher and more spiritual objects which are connected with the progress of the Christian in his journey towards the Heavenly mansions the Saviour has concerned Himself to prepare for His people. For the service in which we are engaged, according to St. Paul in the Epistle, is not a slavery but a sonship. Those who obey the commandments of God do so in virtue of their sonship, and with the aid of the Divine Spirit; those who are led by the Spirit of God are the adopted children of Him whose only Begotten Son received the same Spirit without measure; and, those who are adopted sons of God are the heirs of His moral excellence and eternal gifts, they are joint heirs with the Son of His love, and shall reign with Him as Kings and Priests for ever. So the Gospel also discriminates most vividly between those who put on an outward profession of their attachment to Christ, and call him "Lord, Lord," while they repudiate the glory of His Person and Work, and those who perform the will of God, by the aid of the Divine Spirit, and so produce the fruits of their sonship in their inward dispositions and outward conduct.

IS THE CHURCH IN CANADA DISESTABLISHED?

THE question of disendowment would be more easily answered; but whether the Church has been entirely disestablished here would seem to be rather doubtful. And the question becomes an important one when we begin to think about making regulations for the Church's government. There are two occurrences, of a recent date, which have brought the subject before us with unusual interest. The first case is of *Dunnett v. Forneri*, which, it would appear, is as yet undecided; or at least the decision has not yet been made public. Whether or not the question has puzzled the Court before which the case was brought, we cannot say. It was heard some months ago, and it might have been supposed the time had arrived for delivering the judgment. But it is not yet forthcoming. In a Church entirely free from the trammels of a State control, as ours certainly ought to be, it would be naturally enough imagined that such a Church would be entirely free to receive, suspend, or expel its members, and to grant or withhold at its pleasure any privileges it might have to bestow. The other occurrence was a remark made at the late Toronto Synod in consequence of a proposal to include the Laity in a Canon of Discipline, then brought forward. One or two of the speakers suggested that the Synod had no power to include the Lay members of the Church in such a Canon; that the Act incorporating the Synod only gave that body authority to enact regulations for the government of those who should be members of the Synod, and that it conferred no authority over the private members of the Church; that is to say, the Church in Canada, in the opinion of the speaker in question, has not been sufficiently disestablished to admit of its exercising self-government. For who can doubt that it is to a previous union of the Church and State in this country that the Church owes her disability to regulate her own internal affairs, just as much as the sects and denominations around us have, without any special Act of Parliament for the purpose. If, indeed, such disability really exists, we see no reason why we should be placed in less favourable circumstances for healthy action, and for legitimate growth than the denominations of every shade and stripe in the Dominion. The matter should be at once dealt with; and so far as a Canon of Discipline is concerned, it would certainly be much more satisfactory if such Canon were enacted by the Provincial Synod for the entire Ecclesiastical Province. The ruthless heel of the State might surely be entirely removed from the religious body which it has so sacrilegiously despoiled of the greater part of its rightful possessions, and which might be put at least on an equality with others—if in no better,—still in no worse a position. It would appear that, to a certain extent, the Church in Canada has been disendowed, almost all its revenues having been seized and appropriated to the uses of the State, but that disestablishment has not fully and completely taken place. If such is the

case, we have sustained the loss but have not acquired the emancipation; and it is certainly high time that every disability should be removed, which might hinder the Church from making such arrangements for its internal government as it might deem desirable.

The cost of emancipation from the toils and entanglements of the State is sometimes not inconsiderable. In Canada we have been dispoiled of nearly all the property which was ours as a matter of right and justice. But, as we have said, it would appear to be doubtful whether disestablishment has fully taken place. In Ireland the disendowment has not been so complete as was expected; although, in consequence of its clergy running away with the idea that the endowments still left are the private property of those who now possess them, they are not so beneficial to the Church as might have been anticipated. In England when disestablishment shall come, as more than half the Church's present endowments there came from the private property of individuals who have lived since the reformation, every principle of right and honesty would require a very large proportion of the property she now possesses should still be retained by her, even if such grants as date from Anglo-Saxon times should be considered of doubtful origin.

In Scotland, says the Primus, in the sermon he preached sometime ago at the consecration of his Cathedral: By an Act of Parliament, in the year 1689, the Church was disestablished and disendowed, because as the Preamble of that Act states, the "Presbyterian form of Church Government was more agreeable to the inclinations of the people." However true that may be now, it is considered very doubtful whether it was true then. By that Act of Parliament, the present Established Kirk of Scotland was substituted for the original State Church, the parsonages and stipends of the clergy were taken from them at once, without any compensation, and the rents and emoluments of the Archbishops and Bishops, and of the Deans and Chapters of the Cathedrals were forbidden to be paid to them any longer, and "by their Majesty's authority" were to be received by the Lords of the Privy Council. Now this was rather summary work. When, at the Reformation in England, the Romish Bishops were deprived, they were allowed to hold and possess two-thirds of their benefices to their dying day; and in the recent disendowment of the Irish Church, the life-interests of the Archbishops, Bishops and clergy were carefully guarded. But, in Scotland, the supplies to Bishops and clergy were stopped in six months; and all the emoluments which had belonged to them were swept into the Exchequer, without allowing the former possessors the smallest portion of them for their necessary subsistence.

But Disestablishment in Scotland meant a great deal more than that; and in these days of ecclesiastical turmoil, it is well for us to remember what the Scottish Church has suffered from the hands of their persecutors.

It is true that Episcopacy was not created by the State. Wealth and temporal power